

# ANGLO- SOVIET JOURNAL

## CONTENTS

Ten Days in the Train	Rytkheu
Development of the Soviet Northern Peoples	D. P. Kruchinin ✓
People Who Would Rather Not Mention Love	M. Shmarova
Soviet Science and Agriculture 1948-1953	Alan G. Morton
A Trade Union Group At Work	Tamara Timoshina
S. S. Prokofiev	Bernard Stevens

AND BOOK REVIEWS, ETC.

VOLUME XIV NUMBER 2

SUMMER  
1953

TWO SHILLINGS & SIXPENCE

# SCR

14 KENSINGTON SQUARE, LONDON, W.8. WESTERN 1571

## OFFICERS, 1952-3

**President, Sir Charles Trevelyan, Bt., P.C.; Chairman, D. N. Pritt, Q.C.; Hon. Treasurer, A. W. L. Kessel, M.C., M.B.E., F.R.C.S.; Secretary, Christopher Freeman, B.Sc.(Econ.)**

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**—Dudley Collard, Dr. Horace Joules, Arthur Ling, A.R.I.B.A., Miss Mary Merrall, The Hon. Ivor Montagu, Prof. L. S. Penrose, F.R.S., D. T. Richnell, Gordon Sandison, Miss Judith Todd, Cdr. E. P. Young, R.N. (retd.), Prof. C. L. Wrenn.

**ARCHITECTURE AND PLANNING GROUP.**—*Chairman*: Arthur Ling, A.R.I.B.A., A.M.T.P.I. *Committee*: D. C. Bailey, A.R.I.B.A., A. W. Barr, A.R.I.B.A., Bertram Carter, F.R.I.B.A., Miss Elizabeth Denby, HON. A.R.I.B.A., Prof. R. J. Gardner-Medwin, F.R.I.B.A., R. L. Greatrex, A.R.I.B.A., J. D. Kay, A.R.I.B.A., B. Lubetkin, Colin Penn, A.R.I.B.A., John Pinckheard, A.R.I.B.A., Peter Shephard, B.Arch., A.R.I.B.A., A.M.T.P.I., Gordon Stephenson, F.R.I.B.A.

**CHESS SECTION.**—*President*: Prof. L. S. Penrose, F.R.S. *Vice-Presidents*: I. R. Vessolo, William Winter. *Council*: W. A. Fairhurst, J. Gilchrist, H. Golombek, H. M. Lommer, Kingsley Martin, Julius Silverman, M.P., Miss Eileen Tranmer.

**EDUCATION SECTION.**—*President*: Lady Simon of Wythenshawe. *Vice-Presidents*: G. D. B. Gray, Dr. G. B. Jeffery, F.R.S., Prof. J. A. Lauwerys, Dr. Janet Vaughan, Dame Olive Wheeler. *Chairman*: Miss D. Levin. *Committee*: *Representatives from*—The Association of Headmistresses, The Assistant Mistresses Association, The Association of Teachers in College and Departments of Education, The Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters, The English New Education Fellowship, The Modern Language Association.

**FILM SECTION.**—*Committee*: Anthony Asquith, Ralph Bond, Basil Dearden, Sir Arthur Elton, Bt., Sidney Gilliat, Alfred Junge, Frank Launder, Vivien Leigh, Dr. Roger Manvell, Ivor Montagu, Ronald Neame, Michael Powell, Sir Ralph Richardson, R. C. Sherriff, Harry Watt, Graham Woodford, Basil Wright.

**HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY SECTION.**—*President*: Prof. V. Gordon Childe. *Advisory Council*: Prof. R. R. Betts, Prof. B. Farrington, Dr. W. Gottlieb, Christopher Hill, Dr. R. H. Hilton, Miss N. M. Holley, Allan Merson, Prof. V. Minorsky, A. L. Morton, Andrew Rothstein, Prof. E. Thompson, Prof. G. Thomson. *Committee*: *Chairman*—Robert Browning, Mr. A. K. Halliday, Dr. Eric Hobsbawm, John Morris, Martin Lane, R. Smith, William Watson.

**LEGAL SECTION.**—*Chairman*: Dudley Collard. *Hon. Sec.*: Stanley Moore. *Committee*: Lord Chorley, J. B. Elton, J. Gaster, A. Kiralfy, R. Simon, M. Wilenkin, T. Whitty.

**MUSIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—Rutland Boughton, Alan Bush, Victor Carne, Edward Clark, Prof. Edward Dent, Julian Herbage, Dr. John Ireland, Thomas Russell.

**SCIENCE ADVISORY COUNCIL.**—Prof. J. D. Bernal, F.R.S., Prof. P. M. S. Blackett, F.R.S., Lord Boyd-Orr, F.R.S., Dr. Julian Huxley, F.R.S., Dr. S. M. Manton, F.R.S., Dr. Dorothy Needham, F.R.S., Prof. A. C. Offord, F.R.S., Prof. D. H. Smyth, Sir Robert Watson-Watt, F.R.S. *Chairman of Medical Committee*: A. W. L. Kessel, F.R.C.S.

**SOCIAL SCIENCES SECTION.**—*Advisory Council*: R. Bellamy, Maurice Dobb, Prof. Charles Madge, Dr. R. L. Meek, Mrs. Joan Robinson, Andrew Rothstein, Prof. H. D. Dickinson.

**THEATRE SECTION.**—*President*: Miles Malleston. *Vice-Presidents*: John Burrell, Joseph Macleod, Dame Sybil Thorndike. *Hon. Treasurer*: Mary Merrall. *Committee*: Peter Brook, Lawrance Collingwood, C.B.E., Peter Copley, Rachel Kempson, Martin Lawrence, Beatrix Lehmann, Margaret Leighton, Herbert Marshall, Oscar Quitak, Michael Redgrave, C.B.E., Llewellyn Rees, John Ruddock, Gordon Sandison, R. D. Smith, Gwyneth L. Thurburn.

**WRITERS' GROUP.**—*President*: Sir Compton Mackenzie, O.B.E., LL.D. *Chairman*: Prof. C. L. Wrenn. *Committee*: James Aldridge, Adrian Brunel, Mrs. Cecil Chesterton, O.B.E., Roy Fuller, Jack Lindsay, James MacGibbon, David Magarshack, Bertha Malnick, PH.D., Iris Morley, Montagu Slater, Julian Symons, Dylan Thomas, Alick West.

# The ANGLO - SOVIET JOURNAL

---

Summer 1953. Volume XIV, Number 2.

---

*Editor* : Andrew Rothstein, M.A.    *Assistant Editor* : Stella Jackson, B.A.  
*Editorial Office* : 14 Kensington Square, London, W.8.  
*Telephone* : WESTern 1571.

---

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Soviet Science and Agriculture 1948-1953 . . . . .	Alan G. Morton 2
Relationships Between Advanced Industrial Nations and Backward Peoples	
1. Economic and Cultural Development of the Soviet Northern Peoples . . . . .	D. P. Kruchinin 8
2. Ten Days in the Train . . . . .	Rytkeu 16
Sergei Sergeyevich Prokofiev . . . . .	Bernard Stevens 25
Trade Union Activity in Soviet Factories : 4	
A Trade Union Group at Work . . . . .	Tamara Timoshina 27
V. I. Pudovkin . . . . .	33
People who would rather not mention Love. . . . .	M. Shmarova 34
Book Reviews . . . . .	38
<i>(A Bibliographical Guide to the Russian Language ; Art and Social Life ; Autobiography—Maxim Gorky ; How Music Expresses Ideas ; Journey for Our Time ; Lenin—An Epic Poem ; Meet the Russians ; Modern Russian Reader for Intermediate Classes ; Oxford Slavonic Papers, Vol. III ; Petya the Cock ; Rumanian Summer ; Soviet Law in Action ; Studies in Caucasian History ; The Actress ; The Bolshevik Revolution 1917-1923, Vol. III ; The Russian Menace to Europe ; The Saga of the Sergeant ; The World Chess Championship 1951 ; and K. Marx i F. Engels o Rossii i russkom narode.)</i>	
Publications Received . . . . .	50
SCR Notes . . . . .	51

---

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION 10/- post free ; SCR members 8/6 ; joint SCR/ASJ  
subscription 19/- with reduction to 11/- for students and those not living in the London  
area. Single copies 2/6, post 3d. Back numbers available.

---

Organ of the Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR

# SOVIET SCIENCE AND AGRICULTURE 1948-1953

Alan G. Morton

---

FIVE years have passed since the celebrated session of the All-Union Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences at which the Mendelian theory of heredity was rejected as incorrect, and the Michurinist theory, developed by T. D. Lysenko, was adopted by Soviet scientists as the guide for future research in biology. This decision was taken in all seriousness and for severely practical reasons, because it was believed by the majority of the participants at the session that Michurinist theory would help forward most speedily the progress of agriculture in the Soviet Union. A sense of high responsibility was expressed by almost all the speakers, a determination to use their science effectively in raising the productivity of collective farming.

This attitude is stated with clarity in the words of Academician Lobanov : "The question . . . which we are discussing at this session is one of the utmost importance for the further progress both of the biological and agricultural sciences and of socialist agriculture, with which these sciences are inseparably connected. It is incumbent upon our agricultural science . . . to render daily assistance in the struggle for the further progress of our agricultural production, for the accomplishments of the tasks . . . set before socialist agriculture." And in his closing speech Lysenko himself made the same point : "We must effectively place science, theory, at the service of the people, so that crop yields and the productivity of stock-breeding may increase at a still more rapid pace, that labour on state farms and collective farms may be more efficient. I call upon all Academicians, scientific workers, agronomists and animal-breeders to bend all their efforts and work in close unity with the foremost men and women in socialist farming to achieve these great and noble aims."

Many scientists outside the Soviet Union could not comprehend or share this bold and confident outlook. Seeing a familiar theory rejected, and understanding little of the reasons, they believed that the event would be likely to have ill consequences for Soviet agriculture. Genuine misgivings were felt even by many well-wishers of the Soviet Union, while hostile critics were ready with gloomy, almost gloating, predictions of the imminent ruin of collective farming. Professor Dobzhansky denounced Michurinist theory as a monstrous error, and remarked of the Soviet Government : "Having placed a maniac in charge of their agriculture [Academician Lysenko is meant], they are bound to suffer grave losses in harvests, and this for a long time—losses which are assuredly not welcome to them."

One point is at any rate common ground between Soviet scientists and their critics, namely that the progress of agriculture was bound to be enormously influenced either for good or for ill by the new direction in guiding theory. It is therefore not inappropriate at this time to attempt some estimate of the position and prospects of Soviet agriculture five years after the triumph of Michurinism. The materials for a complete appraisal cannot yet be assembled, nor could such a task be accomplished in a short article. Fortunately, however, the indications from the available information are so clear that a reliable judgment is already possible.

The war inflicted tremendous damage on Soviet agriculture and interrupted the rapid growth which characterised the pre-war decades. In the occu-

pied areas the collective farms were wrecked and plundered (98,000 out of 236,000 throughout the USSR), presenting a fearful problem in reconstruction after the invaders were driven out. Throughout the war, however, the Soviet Union was able to feed herself from the produce of the eastern regions, together with accumulated stocks, in spite of the temporary loss of some of the most productive lands in the west. Following the defeat of Nazi Germany, the rebuilding of agriculture was astonishingly rapid, aided by far-reaching and generous government assistance, so that within three years the pre-war output of almost all crops was equalled or exceeded. Thus in 1948 the 1940 level of agriculture had already been regained. These facts are in themselves a remarkable demonstration of the strength and vitality of the collective system of farming.

Less than two months after the session of the Lenin Academy, as if to underline the connection between science and agriculture which had formed the theme of that meeting, the Soviet Government issued a detailed plan for the introduction (starting from 1949) of the *travopolye* system in all collective farms of the steppe and forest-steppe regions of European Russia. It should be pointed out that this system of husbandry, based on the work of Dokuchaev, Kostychev and Williams, was already widely practised; the 1948 plan provided for its systematic introduction over very extensive areas.

The *travopolye* system is a complete scientifically organised method of agriculture, founded on grass-arable rotations, in which the processes are integrated so as to develop and maintain maximum soil fertility and the highest yields of plants and animals. The principal features of this system as contained in the 1948 plan may be summarised as follows:

1. The planting of forest shelter-belts on all farms along field-rotation boundaries, slopes of ravines, water-partings, rivers and ponds, together with afforestation and fixing of areas of sandy soil.
2. The rational use of the land and the special territorial features of every farm, and the universal introduction of inter-related crop and permanent grass (fodder) rotations.
3. The adoption of correct methods of soil treatment, crop husbandry, and the application of mineral and organic fertilisers.
4. The use of high-grade selected seed of locally adapted high-yielding varieties.
5. The widespread use of irrigation by the efficient management of local water supplies and the construction of ponds and reservoirs.

These measures on individual collective farms were to be combined with the establishment by the State of broad forest shelter-belts extending for hundreds of miles and having a general ameliorating effect on the climate and water regime of large areas.

Parallel with this plan other highly important steps were taken. The movement for voluntary amalgamation of the smaller collective farms was encouraged. This resulted in the creation of larger units which could be more efficiently organised and where science could be more effectively and rapidly applied. At the same time the government took energetic measures for the fullest mechanisation of agriculture. The basis of mechanisation is the network of Machine and Tractor Stations, and the scope of these was developed and their number greatly increased. Many new specialised stations were set up, concerned with the application of machines to particular processes such as shelter-belt planting, technique of livestock farming, land reclamation. The high degree of mechanisation of Soviet agriculture is shown by some figures



for 1952 given by the Ministry. In this year 80% of the spring sowing was mechanised, while combine-harvesters of the Machine and Tractor Stations harvested 72% of the area under grains, 90% of sunflower, 67% of flax, and 90% of sugar beet.

Early in 1949 a comprehensive plan for raising livestock production was issued, proposing a whole series of detailed and concrete measures to this end. The foundation for increased livestock was the production of abundant supplies of fodder, dependent on the development of *travopolye* rotations.

These plans represented the direct application of science to agriculture on a scale which it may be truly said is not known elsewhere in the world. Not only are these plans clearly drawn up with the advice and co-operation of scientists, but they also specifically impose upon Soviet scientists and agronomists, upon the Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences, and upon the various research institutes, the responsibility of guiding and improving the work of collective and state farms, and of helping to fulfil the tasks laid down. There is no doubt of the very active part played by the scientists, and in particular by Lysenko himself, in the work of agriculture.

The general results for the development of agriculture since 1948 were summarised by Malenkov at the Nineteenth Congress of the Communist Party in 1952. In 1952 the wheat crop was 48% above that of 1940, while cotton, sugar beet and fodder crops were (in 1951) respectively 46%, 31%, and 25% above 1940. The output of potatoes, oil plants, meat, dairy products, eggs, wool and hides was higher than pre-war. Perhaps the most telling evidence of increased productivity is furnished by the price reductions announced by the Soviet Government on April 1, 1953. Thus, the price of bread and flour (all types) was reduced 10%; legumes, millet, buckwheat, all fodder grains, oilcake, hay 10%; meat (beef, mutton, pork, poultry, cooked meats, sausages) 10%; butter, margarine, edible oils 10%; sugar 10%; potatoes, vegetables, fruits 50%.

These reductions are even more impressive when it is remembered that they are the *sixth* annual price cut since 1947. In fact the prices of such agricultural products as meat, butter, cheese, vegetables and fruit have fallen to less than one-half since 1947. These figures show that the collective farmers are receiving effective scientific guidance, and that the prognostications of Professor Dobzhansky and others have not been fulfilled.

A very important feature of the tremendous increase in agricultural production is that it does not simply reflect an increase in crop area, although this has also taken place. The significant fact is that yields per hectare have increased, a direct indication of the success of scientific methods and planning. Many of the best collective farms are now producing very high yields indeed. Thus the mean yield of winter wheat over very large areas in the Ukraine in 1951 was 24-26 centners per hectare, while some individual farms secured yields of 30-35 centners per hectare from areas of several hundred hectares. In the Nikolaev region the mean yield of grain crops was 27.5 centners per hectare over 38,000 hectares, with one farm harvesting 34 centners per hectare of winter wheat from several thousand hectares. By no means all collective farms have yet attained such levels, but the figures show what has already been accomplished over large areas and what are the possibilities in the near future.\*

Many figures are now available which graphically illustrate the progress resulting from the adoption of the *travopolye* system. Typical of many are the indices for collective farms of the Chelyabinsk (Trans-Ural) Region, which introduced *travopolye* rotations in 1945.

---

\* In the relatively favourable conditions of Great Britain mean wheat yield is 23-25 centners per hectare, with good farms reaching 38 centners per hectare and over. The record for a small area is 68 centners per hectare.

Year	Grain Crops		Cattle	Sheep	Pigs	Poultry
	Yield per hectare	Gross yield				
1940	100	100	100	100	100	100
1945	72.9	66.8	—	—	—	—
1947	—	—	105	94.1	33.6	67.4
1949	94.2	80.3	133.3	122.3	116.8	265.1
1950	158.8	140.1	—	—	—	—
1951	152.2	140.4	152.8	178.1	228.7	1,425.8

A collective farm in the Moscow region showed the following increases in yield per hectare after adopting the *travopolye* system : grain crops 94%, hay 77%, potatoes 112%. It should be emphasised that the general rise in productivity, of which these are particular examples, is the result of the application of a whole complex of scientific procedures. Some of the more recent developments of agricultural science in relation to production will therefore be briefly discussed.

Much attention and research work is being devoted to increasing the effectiveness of fertilisers by determining the correct time and method of application for various crops. It has been found that fertiliser is best applied in granular form, not powdered, and close to the crop roots, either at the base of the furrow when ploughing or in drills with seed at sowing. Additional fertiliser may be given to particular crops at suitable times in the vegetative period. This method of application in granular form is more economical of fertiliser ; 30-60 kilogrammes per hectare with the seeds are as effective as 200-300 kilogrammes per hectare of powdered fertiliser broadcast. The nutrient is directly available to the plant, while the granular form has a favourable effect on the bacterial population of the soil.

The best type of fertiliser, widely produced and used, consists of a combination of mineral fertiliser (superphosphate) with organic fertiliser (farmyard manure, peat, compost) in granular form. Great efforts are being made to popularise its use among collective farmers. This fertiliser is also used in combination with so-called bacterial manure, that is, with an inoculum of living soil bacteria (*Azotobacter*). The yield of wheat, rye, oats, barley, potatoes may be increased 15-20% by the bacterial inoculum.

These results are of great interest, since bacterial manures have been considered to be useless by many agriculturists outside the Soviet Union. The point is, as the Soviet workers have shown, that to be effective the bacteria used (*Azotobacter*) must be local races isolated from close to the roots of the particular crop. Furthermore, the bacteria must be applied to the seed in combination with phosphate. In these conditions bacterial manuring makes an important contribution to crop production.

Manurial treatment by spraying the vegetative parts has been used very effectively in certain cases. For example, by spraying the leaves of *kok-sagyz* with a solution of superphosphate six weeks prior to the harvest of the roots, the rubber content can be increased by 20%. Similar treatment of sugar beet causes an increase of 2% in sugar content.

Much of the increase in agricultural production can be ascribed to the use by the collective farms of better seed for sowing and of new varieties of plants specifically adapted to local conditions. Several thousand seed farms are engaged in producing high-grade seed of the best local varieties, using Lysenko's methods. Work in plant and animal breeding is being carried out on a wide scale, with special emphasis on the production of varieties adapted to the particular conditions of each natural region. For plants there are now

over 180 selection stations in various regions engaged in this work, and 1,260 varietal-testing plots. Over 1,000 new varieties have been sent for government tests in the last five years, and many of these have been officially adopted as regional varieties. Among new varieties may be mentioned a new winter rye, Volzhanka, produced by Michurinist methods from a local variety, which yields two centners per hectare more than the present standard variety; a winter wheat, Skorospelka, which yields 4-6 centners per hectare more than Novo-Ukrainka; Lgovskaya 873, a winter wheat which in irrigated conditions gives 3-4 centners per hectare more than the standard; a new Siberian winter-hardy wheat, Omskaya 6, created by Lysenko's method of changing spring wheat, Milturum 321, into the winter form. Many varieties of plants have been produced suitable for the adverse conditions of the more northern regions and of Siberia. These rapid advances in plant-breeding are of particular interest since it is in this field of scientific work that the influence of Michurinist theory would be expected to be most immediately reflected.

The use of additional pollination is now widespread, especially on seed plots, as it causes very considerable increases in yield (winter rye, sunflower, and so on). In spite of repeated statements to the contrary made in this country, vernalisation continues to be used on many collective farms as a means of increasing the yield of spring cereals and certain other crops.

The method of cluster sowing, which came into prominence in connection with the growing of young trees in the forest shelter-belts, is now being extended to many other plants. The yield of potatoes, cereals, sunflowers, sugar beet, has been found to be greater when they are cluster-sown. The best size of cluster, distance apart, and method of sowing are being investigated for each crop. The introduction and mechanisation of this method of sowing is already beginning to have significant results.

The reports of the various agricultural research institutes, of which there are many in the Soviet Union, give a picture of the vast amount of scientific work, continually advancing, which forms the foundation for the rapid growth of agriculture now taking place. Agricultural research is concerned both with immediate practical problems and with long-term questions of fundamental theoretical importance. In addition to investigation concerned with the problems which have already been mentioned, work is being done in connection with methods of irrigation, the mechanisation of agricultural operations, the relation between micro-organisms of the soil and plant nutrition, the study of mineral nutrition of plants with labelled atoms, relation between root-fungi (*mycorrhiza*) and plants, agronomic methods for semi-desert sands without irrigation, classification and development of soils, plant and animal genetics, plant diseases, and many other questions. Many problems almost completely neglected in this country are receiving great attention. The vitality and scale of this research make it impossible to do more than mention a few of the lines of work.

One important aspect of the work of scientists and research institutes that must be mentioned is the educational side. In 1950 the Ministry of Agriculture introduced a new system of mass training of collective farmers in three-year agro-zootechnical courses. In 1952 over 2½ million farmers were enrolled for this course, 160,000 specialists being drawn in to the teaching. A large number of short courses were arranged, attended by over 4½ million farmers last year. Attendance at these courses does not involve cutting off the participants from production. In addition 600,000 lectures on advances in agronomy were attended by about 17 million people in the course of a single year, without reckoning many radio talks. Films and leaflets dealing with agriculture are produced, while numerous visits to scientific institutions are arranged. The government encourages the setting up of "Houses of Agriculture" in the villages.



These are intended to be centres of information and instruction in agricultural questions. In all these mass-educational activities scientists and research institutes naturally take a leading part.

Such an attempt to bring scientific theory directly to practical farmers, to arm them with the most advanced scientific methods, to raise the technical ability and the knowledge of millions of ordinary people to a very high level, is something new in the history of the world. By making science the possession of all agricultural workers, the conditions for even more rapid agricultural progress are being established. At the same time science will be enriched and stimulated by the even closer links with practical experience and problems.

The Fifth Five-Year Plan envisages considerable increases in agricultural production. Over the next five years wheat output is to be increased 55-65% ; cotton, flax, sugar beet, potatoes, sunflower by amounts varying from 40% to 70% ; while fodder crops are to be increased by 100-200%. The great expansion in output of fodder crops will form the basis for the planned development of livestock which will provide for an increase in meat and fat output of 80-90%, milk 45-50%, wool 100-150%, and eggs 500-600%. The attainment of these targets depends on very considerable increases in crop yields per hectare. The planned increases are remarkable, but in view of the experience of the last five years there is no doubt that they are attainable and will be attained. In the fulfilment of these plans science is clearly going to play an even greater part than in the past.

This brief survey of recent developments in Soviet agriculture is sufficient to demonstrate the extreme vigour of its growth, and the increasing extent to which science is directly involved. Soviet agricultural science is very closely connected with all the manifold problems of practical farming, and is held responsible for their solution by the people and the government. Judged by its contribution to the advance of agriculture, the Michurinist trend in biological science seems, therefore, to have successfully established its value.

---

### Correction

In *ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL* Vol. XIV, No. 1 (Spring 1953), amend footnotes to Academician Kosminsky's lecture on p. 5 and p. 7 as follows:

p. 5: Footnote should read—*Wat Tyler's Rising*.

p. 7: Footnote should read—Published last year.

# **RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ADVANCED INDUSTRIAL NATIONS AND BACKWARD PEOPLES**

ONE of the greatest innovations in public policy introduced by the Soviet Union—and associated particularly with the name of J. V. Stalin—has been in relationships between advanced industrial nations and backward tribes and peoples previously relegated to colonial status. The innovation consisted in first abolishing all economic and legal privilege for the more advanced peoples, then proceeding from direct economic and political assistance for the former colonies to the radical transformation of their economy: and, parallel with this, pushing forward at the greatest possible speed with the provision of educational and cultural facilities. In recent years attempts have been made, in this country and elsewhere, to hide the resulting truly astonishing advances made by the former subject peoples of the Tsarist Empire by talk about their “exploitation by Moscow”. In reality, close study of the facts reveals the direct opposite of exploitation. In the following two documents, dealing with one of the smaller national groups of Soviet peoples, the study is made from different points of view—that of the Russian historian, and that of the young native writer. We hope in future issues to continue this survey.

## **ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOVIET NORTHERN PEOPLES**

**The Taimyr and Evenki National Areas**

**D. P. Kruchinin**

“THERE are twenty-two border regions in Russia”, said Stalin at the Tenth Party Congress in 1921. “Some of these regions have undergone considerable industrial development and industrially differ very little from Central Russia, others have not yet gone through the stage of capitalism and differ radically from Central Russia, others again are completely downtrodden.”<sup>1</sup>

Among those borderlands which were completely downtrodden were those of the Far North of Tsarist Russia. The twenty-six nationalities of the Far North—Evenki, Nentsy, Nganasany, Khanté, Mansi and others—numbered about 600,000 people in all. Small numbers, dispersion over a vast territory, fragmentation into tribes, multiplicity of language, economic and cultural backwardness, were the characteristics of these peoples before the great October Socialist Revolution.

---

<sup>1</sup> Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*. (London, 1942.)

The policy of the Tsarist Government promoted the extraction of the fur resources of the Northern people by imposing *yasak* [tribute paid in furs] upon them in dimensions which were driving them into complete ruin. The Russian colonial merchants also took part in their unrestrained exploitation. Taking advantage of the simplicity, ignorance and helplessness of the natives, they secured the furs almost for nothing. In 1915, in the regions to the north of Krasnoyarsk, seventeen wholesale buyers controlled the whole trade with the native population.<sup>2</sup>

Only one branch of economy—trapping—had reached the commodity stage. Reindeer-breeding, fishing, and other branches were still at that of natural economy. Tools and supplies for their livelihood, household goods, foodstuffs, and so on, the Northern peoples received from the mainland. The absence of internal exchange, the uniformity of their economic activity, and the isolation of the tribes, were determined not so much by geographical factors as by their colonial position.

Nevertheless, commodity and money relations were penetrating into the economy of the North and hastening the break-up of the clan community. The clan and tribal leaders were appropriating the reindeer, as the principal means of production in the Northern economy. Of 210 households investigated in the Turukhansk Territory in 1918, three had no reindeer, seventy-five households had up to ten, 107 households from ten to fifty, eighteen households from fifty to 200, and seven households from 200 to 1,000 or more.<sup>3</sup> Within the clan, the *kulak* was appearing.

These peoples were going through the stage of the dissolution of the clan and the formation of neighbourhood communities, based on the territorial-economic principle and composed of families belonging to different clans and sometimes to different ethnic groups. Thus one group which roamed in the basins of the rivers Puri and Pyasina consisted of a hundred households, of whom sixty were Enets, thirty Nenets and ten Nganasany.<sup>4</sup>

Up to 1920 the Northern borderlands were effectively cut off from the central authorities of the Soviet Republic. The Communist Party and the Soviet Government, preoccupied with the struggle against internal counter-revolution and foreign military intervention, were unable to give serious attention to problems of Soviet construction in such remote areas. After the forces of Kolchak had been crushed and Soviet power established at Krasnoyarsk, revolutionary committees were set up at the main centres of the Turukhansk Territory—Dudinka and Turukhansk—in January 1920, to take charge of the struggle for carrying the revolution into the depths of the tundra. Their leadership was in the hands of the Turukhansk communist organisation, which by 1921 numbered twenty-four members and eleven probationers.<sup>5</sup>

Although the number of members of the Party was small, their influence was enormous. The poor saw in them their leaders in the struggle against the chiefs and witch doctors. "Nothing will break us", said Nader, spokesman of the poor, at a "judgment of fire" organised by the tribal chiefs on the charge that he was attempting to set up a Soviet in the tundra. "There are

---

<sup>2</sup> Krasnoyarsk Regional State Archives (in later references: KRSA): Yenisei Museum MSS., doc. 2.

<sup>3</sup> A. Y. Tugarinov. The Turukhansk Natives and the Co-operative Movement. Report to the Provincial Co-operative Congress, Krasnoyarsk, 1918.

<sup>4</sup> B. O. Dolikh and M. G. Levin. The Transition from Clan and Tribal to Territorial Communities in the History of the North-Siberian Peoples. In the symposium "Clan Society", Academy of Sciences, 1951, Vol. XVI, pp. 95-108.

<sup>5</sup> KRSA, Folio 1303, doc. 48, p. 49 : doc. 116, p. 17 : doc. 61, p. 71.

Bolsheviks and the Soviet power at Dudinka. You may torture the poor men now, but sooner or later you will get your punishment.”<sup>6</sup>

On Stalin's suggestion a special sub-division for the protection and administration of the Northern tribes was set up in the People's Commissariat for Nationalities. A great deal was done by the Commissariat to explain the nationalities policy of the Soviet power to the Northern peoples. A Council for the study of the nationalities of the RSFSR, a permanent ethnographical department and a special commission to study the economic situation of the nomadic peoples were also formed by the Commissariat.

In 1923 the Krasnoyarsk Provincial Executive Committee drew up the first Statute for nomadic and clan Soviets of the Turukhansk Territory. These adopted as the basis of self-government, not the territorial principle accepted throughout the USSR, but the clan, as a temporary transitional form which made it possible for the Soviets to come closer to the general mass of the working population of these nomadic backward peoples and to draw them into active participation in public affairs.<sup>7</sup>

In 1930 the Central Executive Committee of Soviets of the Russian Federation approved the formation of eight National Areas in the North: Ostyako-Vogul, Yamalo-Nenets, Taimyr, Evenki, Vitimo-Olekminsk, Chukot, Koryak and Okhotsk. This decision was celebrated by the working people of the North as a great national holiday. At the first Area Congress of Evenki Soviets there gathered not only delegates from all parts of the tundra, but a great mass of working people as guests. The national principle of demarcation was based on separating out into National Areas territories which included either the maximum number of people of one nationality or several peoples and tribes closely related historically, economically, culturally and in their way of life. Thus Evenki represented 90% of the population of the Evenki National Area, while the Taimyr (Dolgano-Nenets) Area included territories inhabited by several peoples (Dolgani, Nentsi, Entsi, Nganasany, Trans-tundra Peasants).

National Areas represent a form of Soviet national autonomy with every possibility for limitless economic and cultural development. In their size and natural wealth they exceed many capitalist states of Europe. Thus the Evenki National Area is larger than Great Britain, Germany, Belgium and Holland put together, while the Taimyr National Area is larger than the combined territories of France and Norway.

Great attention was paid by Lenin and Stalin to the problems of development of the Northern borderlands. In 1920, on Lenin's suggestion, a Northern Scientific and Industrial Expedition was organised by the Supreme Economic Council. Among its directors were leading representatives of Russian science and culture, such as A. P. Karpinsky, E. A. Fersman, Maxim Gorky, Professor Y. M. Shokalsky and others. Smaller expeditions were sent to individual districts in large numbers; thus 115 were sent to the Turukhansk Territory alone between 1919 and 1930.

From the outset these expeditions discovered vast and varied forms of natural wealth, which became the basis for transforming a harsh, backward and almost empty borderland into an economically developed region of the Soviet State. But this required the radical socialist reconstruction of the economic system of the Northern peoples and the aid of the industrial centres and the Russian people.

Direct exchange between State trading and co-operative organisations and the working people of the North became the keystone of the system of economic measures for emancipating the Northern peoples from national exploitation

---

<sup>6</sup> *Soviet Taimyr*, October 7, 1950.

<sup>7</sup> KRSA, Folio 757, doc. 5.

and from the Russian private merchant. By February 1927, in the territory north of Krasnoyarsk, there were functioning twenty-one consumers' societies with forty-nine trading centres in the tundra, while more than 50% of the households of the native population were organised in "integral" co-operatives, i.e. those with both selling and purchasing functions. Soviet co-operation by these means squeezed out the private merchant, established exchange at a fair equivalent and organised the marketing of new products from the north—fish, skins, fats, game, nuts, reindeer products, and so on. Among the Northern peoples this co-operative development promoted new crafts and restricted the activity of the native exploiting class. The co-operatives became an important lever in social life, centres of cultural and educational work. Here the hunter, the fisherman, the deer-breeder not only exchanged the products of their labour but also received the advice of veterinary specialists<sup>8</sup> and medical aid; here too they became acquainted with the radio and the cinema.

The development of large-scale industry and transport in the North required the assistance of skilled Russian workers. In ten years (1926-35) the number of workers in the North grew from 8,200 to 157,000, the majority of them Russian workmen who helped to train the local population for work in the factories, pits and State farms. Beginning as guides to prospecting parties, the Nentsi, Evenki, Sakha, Nganasany became mechanics, engineers, drivers and so on. Between 1926 and 1935 the number of native workmen rose from 1,200 to 17,000.<sup>9</sup>

The industrialisation of the USSR made it possible to solve the problem of setting up the Northern Sea Route, which became a most important factor in industrialising the national areas. Similarly, the establishment of regular steamer routes on the Yenisei, Khatanga, Pyasina and other rivers facilitated the development of industry, promoted closer contact between agricultural districts and industrial centres and led to the growth of population around the latter, while encouraging the development of agriculture and fisheries. The gross income from fisheries in the Avam district, Taimyr area, was four times as large in 1943 as in 1940, and four and a half times as large in the Khatanga district. The development of industry proved a most important factor in the national consolidation of the peoples of the North, by promoting their economic development in every sphere.<sup>10</sup>

Collectivisation was completed in the Evenki National Area (98% of households) and the Taimyr National Area (99%) by 1939.<sup>11</sup> All these collective farms were composed of households belonging to different clans and even different ethnic groups. Thus the Kirov collective farm, Taimyr National Area, in 1948 comprised 45% Nentsi, 42.1% Entsi, 10.3% Dolgani, 1.6% Nganasany, 0.3 Russians.<sup>12</sup> The "New Life" and "Far Northerner" collective farms are composed of Nentsi and Entsi, the "Pur" collective farm combines Nganasany and Entsi, and so on. With this advance from the patriarchal clan to socialist economy the *kulaks* disappeared. Whereas in 1932 58.5% of the reindeer in the Taimyr Area belonged to the *kulaks*, by 1939 the socially owned herd and the household animals of the collective farms represented 91% of the total, 8.4%

---

<sup>8</sup> KRSA, Folio 1205, doc. 71, p. 40.

<sup>9</sup> P. E. Terletsky. The Population of the Far North. *Soviet Arctic*, 1936, No. 11, p. 39.

<sup>10</sup> Soviet geographies show sawmills in the Nenets National Area, food industries in the Yamalo-Nenets N.A., non-ferrous ore-mining in the Taimyr N.A., etc.—Ed.

<sup>11</sup> KRSA, Folio 1444, doc. 14; *Evenki New Life*, Nov. 15, 1940.

<sup>12</sup> B. O. Dolgikh. The Kirov Collective Farm, Taimyr National Area. *Soviet Ethnography*, 1949, No. 4, p. 76.



belonged to State institutions and 0.6% to individual owners outside the collective farms.<sup>13</sup>

The technical advance of collective production can be exemplified by the "New Life" collective farm. Between 1934 and 1939 the number of its boats increased from forty-one to sixty-nine, and that of its nets from twenty to thirty-four. In 1934 it possessed 911 traps, while by 1943 their number had increased to 5,377, most of them improved factory-made types.<sup>14</sup> Electricity came to reinforce collective farming, and by 1951 fourteen collective farms of the Taimyr National Area had their own power stations.<sup>15</sup>

Collective farming solved one of the most complex problems of the Far North—the question of the settlement of nomadic peoples. In 1927, of 2,507 native households in the Turukhansk Territory, only eighty-six were settled. Collective farming made it possible to combine reindeer-breeding with a settled existence. As collective farms were organised, large herds began to be looked after by specially appointed teams of shepherds. These accompany the herds as they move from pasture to pasture, while the rest of the working population, together with the families of the shepherds, remain in the collective-farm centre and engage in other occupations, including agriculture. Beginning with 1937, special land-settlement expeditions undertook the extensive work of distributing and planning the economic centres for the collective farms adopting a settled form of existence, taking into account connections with the outside world and with the district centre and nomad Soviet, access to fisheries, land suitable for cultivation, reindeer pastures, water supplies, harbour facilities and even the landscape and southerly aspect.<sup>16</sup> By 1944, every collective farm of the Taimyr National Area had its centre, which gradually became an inhabited place. Thus the "New Life" collective farm, the first to adopt a settled form of existence, built in two years five two-flat houses for aged members, acquired thirty-nine mobile huts on *narty* (large sledges)—each hut from six and a half to thirteen feet long and from three to six feet wide—built a medical aid station, a school, a collective farm office, a library with radio set, a mechanical workshop, a fat-rendering workshop, stables and a public bath.<sup>17</sup>

These changes of social structure led to the introduction of branches of economy hitherto unknown in the North—tillage of the soil, dairy farming and horse breeding. The State farms attached to industrial enterprises took the initiative, raising their cultivated lands from 270 acres in 1933 to 2,700 acres in 1939. The collective farms followed suit. In 1940, horses and cows were imported into the Taimyr Area for the first time. By 1948, 75% of the collective farms of the Dudinka district, 25% in the Khatanga district, 23% in the Ust-Yenisei district, and 10% in the Avam Tundra district, were breeding horses. In this way industrialisation and collectivisation created the conditions for the development of a varied and balanced economy in the North.<sup>18</sup>

The material welfare of each household has risen with the economic development of the communities of which it forms part. Parallel with this has gone cultural development.

One of the first measures of the Turukhansk Executive Committee was the organisation of schools for the children of the native population and for

---

<sup>13</sup> *Evenki New Life*, Nov. 15, 1940.

<sup>14</sup> KRSA, Folio 1386, doc. 485; Folio 1444, doc. 35.

<sup>15</sup> *Soviet Taimyr*, Jan. 22, 1952.

<sup>16</sup> *Evenki New Life*, March 22, 1941.

<sup>17</sup> KRSA, Folio 1386, doc. 485.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, doc. 439; M. P. Plotkin. *The Geography of the Taimyr National Area*, p. 59 (Dissertation in the Lenin Library, Moscow); *Soviet Taimyr*, Oct. 19, 1950.

eliminating illiteracy among adults. By 1923 there were eight schools in the Territory, while in 1924 the Turukhansk Executive said in its report : " Education in this district is in no way inferior to that in others, and has never reached such an advanced level. In addition to the children's schools, seventy adults are learning to read and write in their own school." In 1925 the Executive drew up a plan of educational development which provided for three special schools with hostels for children of the native population.<sup>19</sup>

The boarding school and nomad school became the main types of school in the North. The boarding school, in addition to ordinary education, acquainted the children with the practices of civilised life, promoting thereby the spread of culture among the population. The nomad school moved with the changes of pasturage. All the work of the schools was adapted to the particular traditions and needs of the people, based on regional ethnological study, and the school year fitted in with the economic calendar. Gradually the schools won the confidence of the people and became an important instrument in the transformation of their patriarchal clan society and the development of their political consciousness.

Furthermore, practice suggested a special form of cultural activity—the cultural base.

These were set up in the most remote areas. The first was organised in the Evenki territory, at Tura in the mouth of the river Kochachumo in 1927. It became the centre around which four to five thousand Evenki were roaming, influencing a territory of nearly four million square miles. Later, cultural bases, fifteen in all, were organised at Khoseda-Khord for the Nentsi, Sosvin for the Voguls, Kosyn for the Ostyaks, Khatanga for the Dolgani, Nanai for the Lamuts, Penzhin for the Koryaks, Chukotka for the Chukchi and Eskimos, and so on. In these cultural bases were concentrated the Area or district Soviet bodies, the scientific research station, boarding school, kindergarten, crèche, hospital, health centre, veterinary station with its laboratory, integral co-operative, public baths, meteorological station, power station, and so on. The " Regulations for Cultural Bases " adopted by the Government Committee for the North define the main aim of these bases as to draw the native population into the work of socialist construction.<sup>20</sup>

Nomad " red *chooms* " [Siberian tents of reindeer hide] and schools moved together with the people. Under the general direction of the cultural base, they carried on planned cultural and political work at fairs and popular assemblies, and later, as collective forms of economy were adopted, in the teams of hunters and fishermen.

As time went on, the cultural bases grew into inhabited places of urban type, centres of the National Areas and districts. Thus out of a cultural base organised in an absolutely desert spot, where previously there had been one miserable building—the former merchant " factory "—Tura developed into the centre of the Evenki National Area, thanks to the great work done by Party and Soviet organisations. Khatanga, which had a population in 1917 of only seventeen persons, has become a district centre of the Taimyr National Area, the economic and cultural centre of the Far North, with district institutions, hospital, school, club, shops, restaurant, library and workshops. Higher up the river Khatanga a canning factory with a workers' settlement has grown up, and nearby the centre of a collective farm. All the way down the river

---

<sup>19</sup> KRSA, Folio 1303, doc. 38, p. 9 ; *Ibid.*, doc. 116, p. 137 ; Folio 49, doc. 412, p. 8 ; *Ibid.*, doc. 42, p. 9.

<sup>20</sup> Minutes of the Joint Plenary Session of the Committee for the North with delegates to the XII Congress of Soviets of the RSFSR. *Northern Asia*, 1925, Vol. III, Appendix 3, p. 111.

are scattered the buildings of the river steamship route, workshops, nurseries and glasshouses. Thus the cultural bases have developed into important economic and cultural centres promoting the consolidation of the Northern peoples into a single socialist nation.

Not one of these peoples had its own alphabet before the October revolution. The creation of such alphabets was begun in 1922 by a special commission representing the People's Commissariats for Nationalities and Education, the Academy of Sciences and the leading specialists in linguistics and ethnography. In 1932 the work of creating alphabets for sixteen peoples of the North, on the basis of the Russian alphabet but adapted to the phonetic peculiarities of the Northern languages, was completed.

The influence of the Russian language on the formation of these national languages is truly great, but it shows itself mainly in their vocabulary, without injuring their independent tradition. In the new conditions of a socialist society, the languages of the peoples of the North are advancing through the perfecting of the main elements already existing within them. The Russian language helps them to select for their further development the most progressive elements of grammatical structure.

Collectivisation, with its multiplying of relations and communications between the various tribes, facilitated the diminution of differences between them: and cultural development carried the process of unification farther. The Nenets and Enets languages are so much akin that to pass from one to the other proved easy.

The creation of a written language naturally accelerated the development of national culture. In all the primary schools of the Evenki Area by 1942 education was proceeding in the native language. When the Area was formed, there were only three primary schools, in which native children numbered only ten. By the fifth anniversary of the Area (1935) there were twenty-five schools with 591 children, of these 265 being Evenki and Yakuts. In 1940 there were 1,780 children at school, 816 of them children of the native population.

In the Taimyr Area in 1940 there were at school 458 children of Sakha nationality, 30 Evenki, 117 Nentsi, 61 Nganasany. Between 1942 and 1950 the number of schools in this Area increased from twenty-three to forty-four, and the number of boarding schools among them from nineteen, with 890 native children, to twenty-six, with 1,086 native children.<sup>21</sup>

By 1934 there had been published in the languages of the peoples of the North about 200,000 textbooks, over 100,000 volumes of political literature, about 4,000 volumes on industrial questions, and 6,000 on medical questions.<sup>22</sup>

If a national intelligentsia was to be created, it was necessary to set up secondary and specialised schools. By 1945, out of thirty-eight schools in the Taimyr National Area, four were continuation and seven secondary schools. By 1947 there were throughout the Far North 600 schools, of these 109 continuation schools and forty secondary schools. "Our people in the past had not the least idea what schools and hospitals were", said an Evenki delegate at the Krasnoyarsk Extraordinary Congress of Soviets in 1936. "Among us Evenki and Yakuts there were none who could read and write, nobody thought or worried about health or labour protection, nobody even mentioned such subjects. Under the Soviet power, we saw the light. We know that the Party is concerned for us, we know also that the Party is spending a lot of money

---

<sup>21</sup> KRSA, Folio 1383, doc. 832, p. 31; and doc. 562, p. 3; *Ibid.*, Folio 1386, doc. 129.

<sup>22</sup> Index of Literature in Languages of the Northern Peoples, 1931-33. Institute of Peoples of the North, Leningrad, 1934.

on us, so that we shall rise politically and culturally and take part in the public life of the country.”<sup>23</sup>

Of first-class importance in the training up of a national intelligentsia was the Institute of Peoples of the North established by the Soviet Government at Leningrad. By 1938 there were 355 students from the tundra and taiga peoples at the Institute, and forty post-graduate students working in the Research Association attached to the Institute. Furthermore, about 1,200 representatives of the Arctic youth were studying the same year in various universities and technical colleges of the Soviet Union. Four divisions with seven chairs exist in the Northern Peoples' Faculty of Leningrad University: they train teachers for the Evenki, Khanté, Mansi, Nenets, Even, Chukot, Koryak, Nivkh and Nanai schools. Problems of the history, economics and culture of the peoples of the North are the subject of research at this Faculty, which also produces textbooks for the primary schools and teachers' training colleges of the Far North, for the Northern sections of the Herzen Pedagogical Institute (secondary school teachers' training college) and for the Northern Faculty itself.<sup>24</sup>

In 1949 there were special divisions of peoples of the North, training national cadres for twenty-two Northern peoples, in three of the higher educational establishments of the USSR—the Leningrad and Khabarovsk Pedagogical Institutes and Leningrad University. The dissertations submitted by Northern students at Leningrad alone, in 1949, showed that young men and women capable of advanced scientific research and contributions to culture are appearing in considerable numbers.

Among the peoples of the North there are now their own business managers, doctors, teachers, engineers, veterinary surgeons, and so on. In the Taimyr National Area, where before the October Revolution there were a few Russian literates and not a single native literate, there were in 1939 728 people working in the sphere of education, the press and the arts, and 328 in the sphere of national health. In their letter to Stalin in 1936, the Taimyr working people wrote that they had throughout the area three clubs, six red *chooms*, seven libraries, and six projectors. By 1950 there were established in the Area five Houses of Culture and three village clubs, thirteen red *chooms* and fourteen village reading-rooms, twelve libraries, six permanent cinemas and six mobile projectors.<sup>25</sup> Similar advances are recorded in the Nenets, Chukot and other National Areas.

The tempo and scope of the cultural revolution among the peoples of the North has found its reflection in the budgets of the collective farms themselves. Thus for example the allocation for cultural and welfare needs and training of personnel in the “New Life” collective farm (Taimyr Area) was 998 roubles in 1935 and 27,233 roubles by 1938. The allocation for education in the budget of the Taimyr Area in 1950—14 million roubles—was 280 times larger than in 1930.<sup>26</sup>

The national culture and literature of the peoples of the North are developing rapidly. The works of Pushkin have been translated into the Evenki language by Evenki translators. They have also translated works of Turgenev, Nekrasov, Leo Tolstoy, Korolenko, Chekhov, Gorky, Mayakovsky, Fadeyev and other modern Soviet writers. Many words from Russian, conveying concepts unknown in the North before the revolution, have enriched the vocabulary of the Northern peoples. National poets and writers in their own literature have become well known throughout the Union, such as the Evenki Alexei

---

<sup>23</sup> KRSA, Folio 1383, doc. 562.

<sup>24</sup> *Leningrad University Gazette*, 1950, No. 2.

<sup>25</sup> *Soviet Taimyr*, Sept. 3, 1936, and Aug. 22, 1950.

<sup>26</sup> KRSA, Folio 1386, doc. 485, p. 6; *Soviet Taimyr*, Nov. 7, 1950.

Salatkin, Alexei Platonov, Grigori Chinkov, Nikita Sakharov; the Eveni Nikolai Tarabukin, Nikolai Cherkonov; the Nanai Akim Semar; the Khant Grigori Lazarev; the Mansi Matriona Vakhrusheva; the Nenets Nikolai Vylko; the Koryak Ketsoi Kekketyn; the Chukchi Ermategin and Tynetev; the Udegei D. Kimonko.

The national art of the peoples of the North is developing as well as their literature. The first artists are maturing in the amateur art circles and their national theatre is being born. On the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Khanté-Mansi National Area, at Salekhard, over 300 took part in the displays of amateur art. Hundreds of talented children of the North are studying in the art and theatrical institutes of the USSR. At an amateur art display, in the Russian Museum at Leningrad, twenty-one painters and thirteen sculptors from the Far North took part. The sculptures "Struggle of a Man and a Reindeer" by the Nenets Bolotnikov and "The Doe" by the Koryak Kichigin have been cast in bronze and acquired by the Academy of Fine Arts, and the sculpture "Bear Hunt" by the Gilyak (Nivkh) Lenzheto has been reproduced in porcelain at the Lomonosov works. The Chukcha Vukvol, a talented artist, has provided rich illustrations to the collection of folk tales of his people. His engraving on ivory "The Chukot Legend of Lenin" is preserved in the Museum of the Revolution. The high mastery of the Nenets artist Pankov and the Udegei Aza is concentrated on representing the new Soviet tundra. Their pictures won gold medals at the Paris International Exhibition.

As a result of the wise national policy of Lenin and Stalin, and with the help of the great Russian people, the working masses in the North have come out on to the high road of spiritual renaissance. Their socialist national culture has only just left its cradle, but its very first steps already demonstrate their rich creative abilities.

*Abridged from VOPROSY ISTORII, No. 2, 1953.*

## **TEN DAYS IN THE TRAIN**

**Rytkheu**

---

I WOKE up at dawn. Drawing the curtain aside a little, I looked out of the window. The girders of a bridge were flashing past. Perhaps that was what had woken me; the sound had changed. When a train goes over a bridge the axles make a different noise.

The river was flowing quietly and gently by. I think it was the Vyatka. It may have been some other river, though. I didn't quite know, and there wasn't anyone I could ask. Geutegin was lying with only a sheet over him, sleeping peacefully. The blanket had slipped down to his knees and was billowing and swaying to the rocking of the carriage. The couple in the lower bunks were asleep too.

The bridge's metal girders continued to flash past the window, and beyond them could be seen the water, with the morning sky reflected in it. I lay on my stomach and gazed happily at the rose-tinted golden clouds reflected in the calm water.

Then the river was no longer to be seen, though we were still on the



bridge. It was at least twice as long as the river's width. "Allowing for the spring floods," I thought.

At last the bridge came to an end. We went past a small birch grove, some allotments, a few tiny houses, and then a level crossing. The gate was shut ; in front of it three lorries, a Pobeda car and two cyclists were waiting. The lorries were evidently carrying wheat from the new harvest ; they were loaded with sacks and their sides were covered with red bunting, with slogans written on it that I couldn't read. One of the cyclists had alighted, waiting for the train to get past, while the other, still in the saddle, was holding on to the side of a lorry with one hand and talking to a girl sitting up above on the sacks. After the level crossing allotments and little houses floated past again, only now it was all moving more slowly ; the train was slowing down.

We stopped at a station, but I couldn't read the name because our carriage was at the back of the train. All I could see was a single-storeyed brick building marked Luggage Office. I decided I would read the name when the train started again and our carriages came level with the station building.

Meanwhile I turned on my side, shut my eyes and began thinking about the story I had begun a week before my departure. Then I dozed off, and when I opened my eyes again it was already ten o'clock, and I had slept the whole morning.

The curtains were drawn back and the sun was shining brightly through the window. Geutegin's bed was neatly made and he was sitting below talking to the people who were sharing our compartment.

Our companions spoke Russian with difficulty. We had noticed this the night before when we got on the train. Geutegin and I had arrived at the station, with a whole crowd of people who were seeing us off, half an hour before the train was due to leave. We had thrown our cases down on our bunks and returned to the platform and stood there talking to our friends. The coach gradually filled up. A couple approached the attendant, a man of about fifty and a very attractive woman of about forty. Taking out his tickets, the man inquired : "Second class sleeper ?" "Sleeper, that's right," replied the attendant. "This way, please. You're in number three."

The passenger's pronunciation, the cut of his suit, his companion's light grey travelling coat, and the many-coloured labels on the case the porter was carrying for them, were all a bit out-of-the-way. "Must be foreigners," said Geutegin.

The friends who were seeing us off in Moscow had come with us from Leningrad that day. They were university friends of ours who were going for their practical somewhere in the Moscow Region.

We talked on the platform right up to the moment the train went, and then we stood on the steps of the train and shouted to them and waved our hats as the train gathered speed. We had completely forgotten about the couple with the much-labelled case until we went back to our places, when we found that we were in the same compartment and that they were to be our companions as far as Khabarovsk.

Geutegin had not been mistaken. They were foreign tourists. He was a professor of philology from Liège and she was his wife, an artist. She made a lot of mistakes in speaking Russian. His Russian was better, but rather stilted, and he had a foreign accent. Though his own Russian was not faultless, he corrected his wife with evident satisfaction.

When they learned that Geutegin and I were Chukchi, studying in Leningrad and on our way to Chukotka,\* they were amazed. They talked to us more or less as they might have talked to Martians setting off on the return journey to Mars.

\*The Chukot National Area, in the extreme north-east of Siberia. Area about 275,000 square miles. Capital, Anadyr. The Area is part of Khabarovsk Territory.—Ed.

They were very tactful, though, and tried hard not to show too much tiresome curiosity.

The professor had wise, kindly eyes and a nice smile. Both he and his wife were very simple and natural. We liked them, but we could nevertheless feel surprise mingled with distrust in practically every glance and in almost every question. At first this amused us, but later it began to pall, and we went off to the restaurant car. When we returned our companions were already asleep.

But now a new day had arrived, and below me the conversation had been renewed. And, of course, it was once again about the same thing, the peoples of the Far North and their "extraordinary everyday life", their "outstanding character" and the "fascinating primitiveness of their art". I pretended to be still asleep.

"Our interests must seem rather naive to you," said the Professor. "And perhaps, well, perhaps a bit of a nuisance. Don't be cross. For us this is a, what should I say, a very happy meeting. We were both delighted with that novel about the Chukchi. What was it called?"

"*Alitet Goes to the Hills*," Geutegin prompted him.

"Yes, yes. *Alitet*. Merci. And generally speaking, it interests us so much. My wife has a whole collection. Such wonderful little figures. Deer, walruses, polar bears. And then those interesting long sledges."

"*Narty*."

"Yes, *narty*. It's all a sort of fairy tale to us. Beyond the Arctic Circle. Brrr! And all of a sudden, this meeting. We've never met real live Chukchi before."

The professor and his wife both laughed. I couldn't see Geutegin, who was sitting beneath my bunk.

"Don't misunderstand me. I'm not in the least angry. On the contrary, your interest pleases me very much. A lot of things about us are interesting. And it must be confessed"—he adopted the same tone as the professor—"that I've never met real live Belgians before."

"Oh!" exclaimed the professor's wife. "I didn't know Chukchi had so much humorosity."

"Sense of humour, Claudine," her husband corrected her.

"Yes. Such a sense of humour. And so much, what's the word, so much vitality."

"Vivacity," he corrected her again.

"Yes. Vivacity."

"I'm afraid I can't accept your compliment, madame. You were right the first time. We have neither the vivacity nor the humour of Southerners. Cold water runs in our veins and we live solely on ice-cream."

"Don't tease us, Monsieur Geutegin. Do you deny there are such things as peculiarities of national character?"

"Not at all, Monsieur Leerlink. Only we do deny that these peculiarities are determined by geography. And what's more, we don't believe such characteristics are changeless. It can happen that people who were even regarded as doomed to die out—not by our Soviet scholars—may become strong and happy. In definite conditions, of course!"

"You seem to want to jump from ethnography to politics."

"You prefer to wander in ethnography and give politics a wide berth?"

I decided to cut the argument short, and so, pretending I had just woken up, I said "Good morning."

The Belgians wished me "Good morning" too, but Geutegin, with his usual pedantry, said "Good day."

The Belgians soon found an excuse for going out into the corridor. I

obviously wouldn't be able to dress under the blankets. I jumped out of the bunk and asked : " How are you, Monsieur Geutegin ? "

" Not so good. I feel just like a wax doll in a glass case at an anthropology museum."

" Well, I think a wax doll would be proud, if it could feel anything. It would be proud of the attention of its audience and of the opportunity of adding to their knowledge. And anyway, dolls don't start arguing with the visitors."

" Do you think I was too sharp ? " Geutegin was alarmed. " You know I didn't mean to offend them. I think they're rather nice old dears."

" Come off it ! Claudine's hardly an old woman."

" No. And Maurice is still youngish."

" Oh, is his name Maurice ? "

" Yes. They're really very good company. If only they wouldn't think of us as some sort of curiosities. I feel as if they want to keep touching us to make sure we're real. A Chukcha is something utterly out-of-the-way to them, some sort of arctic oddity. Whatever you're talking to them about, they can't forget for an instant that you're a Chukcha. They seem to be most disappointed that we're wearing ordinary jackets and not deerskins."

" Well, what if they are ? Be a bit more tolerant, old man. After all, remember where they've come from."

" Yes, I recognize all that," sighed Geutegin. " I see we shall have to devote the next ten days to this professor and his wife."

" Look here," I said faint-heartedly, " we could ask the attendant to shift us to the next compartment. There'll be two places there, I think. Two are only booked as far as Sverdlovsk."

" That would be rude."

" How would it ? I'm not suggesting running away. We could say we didn't want to crowd them."

" Wouldn't work. Someone else would soon be put in with them. No. We mustn't forget we're their hosts. It does put an obligation on us. As passengers we're equals, but as citizens, so to speak. See ? Guests are guests. Especially as they're really rather nice guests."

" All right," I agreed. " As you say."

And throwing a towel over my shoulder, I went away to wash.

Day followed day. Molotov, Sverdlovsk, Omsk, Novosibirsk. The plain gave way to the mountains and the mountains were replaced by lowlands and marshes overgrown with bushes. We were crossing the West Siberian lowlands.

Our companions took an interest in everything : the border between Europe and Asia, the system of time belts, the elderly collective farm woman—a Hero of Socialist Labour—in the next carriage, the diverting of the Siberian rivers. We told them everything we could, introduced them to the collective farmer, showed them on the map how the waters of the Irtysh could be turned to the south, towards the sands of Kazakhstan. Professor Leerlink and his wife were attentive and unprejudiced listeners. The size of the country astounded them. " We've got no use for time belts in Belgium," joked the professor. They were even more amazed by the immense scale of our construction schemes, the embodiment of the great plans for the transformation of nature.

We very much enjoyed telling them of our country's successes, especially as the professor was keeping a diary, which he intended publishing on his return to Belgium.

One thing very much embarrassed us. We were ourselves the object of constant study. Professor Leerlink would question us with great interest about Chukotka, listen to our stories, and then pensively add something of this sort :

"I suppose that houses instead of *yarangi*, and electric light instead of those, oh, what are they called, instead of those walrus-oil lamps, I suppose it's all progress, great progress. But it means the North losing its special character, its poetic quality, doesn't it?"

At such moments I would look at him, surprised to find that his eyes still seemed to me wise. But Geutegin would say: "No, thank you. We'll manage to scrape along somehow without poetry." After a short pause he added by way of explanation: "Without that sort of poetry, anyhow."

The mechanisation of fishing, and even the disappearance of *shamans*\* from the Chukot settlements, distressed our companions. It wasn't that they were enemies of progress. They really believed themselves to be people of advanced opinions. Only we, in our rejoicing that the terrible backwardness of our country had at last been brought to an end, seemed to them people who couldn't understand "how much more prosaic life had been made by civilisation".

Geutegin was trying hard not to become heated. "You must understand, professor," he said, "that the life our people have left behind was not life to them but gradual death. And not so gradual at that, to tell the truth. That's why we hate backwardness so much. We find our poetry in other things. We see poetry in the struggle against our unrelenting climate and against that same backwardness; in our people's rebirth, in the electricity that lights up the Chukchi settlements——"

"Electricity and poetry are different things, Monsieur Geutegin, quite different."

"Well, we see more in common between them, different as they may be, than we do between poetry and the Chukchi's thrice-accursed old life. The point seems to be that you're attributing to us all the evils of capitalist civilisation, all its 'prosaic' features, as you call them . . . To put it bluntly, professor, you're not allowing for the fact that we are building a completely different civilisation, a non-capitalist one."

This was exactly the point the professor was trying not to discuss. But Geutegin, who had forgotten his intention of not becoming heated, went on: "There are two types of bourgeois nationalism, two types of national arrogance. The first is an open and conscious arrogance. We have the same feelings about that, so don't let's discuss it. But there is another type as well, sometimes unconscious. A man considers himself the friend of all peoples, but admires not what makes small nations strong but what makes them, or used to make them, weak, and even what people have invented about them."

The professor threw up his hands with a smile, and the argument ended in a joke. I tried to console our companions by telling them that when Geutegin and I finished our course at the university and ultimately returned to Chukotka we should often have to make use of poetic dog-teams rather than prosaic motor-cars.



WE WERE approaching Krasnoyarsk. I was standing by the corridor window when Geutegin came up to me.

"Listen, why do these Belgians speak French to each other?" he said.

"Because they're from the south."

"What difference does that make?"

"In the south of Belgium everyone speaks French. There isn't any actual Belgian language."

"Are you sure?"

---

\* Witch-doctors.—Ed.

"Ask them yourself, if you don't believe me. In the south they speak French and in the north Flemish."

"Flemish?"

"Yes. That's a sort of Dutch."

"But they were speaking French."

"That means they come from southern Belgium. I think Liège is in the south."

"I understood practically everything they said. You know, they were talking about us. It was a bit embarrassing really."

"Why should *you* feel embarrassed? We don't talk Chukchi in front of them."

"That's not what I mean. I mean they were being so enthusiastic."

"Really? What were they saying? Were they surprised at Chukchi looking like human beings?"

"No. This time I think they weren't making allowances on account of our origin. They were just saying we were fine chaps. He even said he'd gladly swap a good many of his students at Liège for us."

"Would he, indeed!"

"Yes. Something of that sort, if I understood everything properly. Their pronunciation's different from the way our French teacher speaks. What did you tell them about the Northern Faculty?"

"Only that I was studying there. Why?"

"Well, he was suggesting that all the same the standards in the Northern Faculty must be lower. See? He said there probably must be a special curriculum, the standard must be easier."

"What did you say to him?"

"Well, they were talking to each other. I haven't told them I understand French."

"Oh, yes, I forgot. I'm surprised you managed to contain yourself. How you must have suffered!"

Geutegin was not studying at the Northern Faculty. He had just finished the mathematics course. But our companions evidently thought that Chukchi could not aspire to the normal faculties, and that they and other northerners had to have a special faculty, easier and more readily assimilable.

We didn't mention it again that day, but next day I began asking the professor about the University of Liège, and incidentally told him something about Leningrad. In particular I told him it was not only northerners that studied in our faculty, but anyone interested in the philology of northern languages. I mentioned that it cut both ways, many northerners studying in other faculties if they chose a special subject, and that Geutegin, for instance, was studying in the Mathematics Faculty.

"Oh! The professor looked at Geutegin with respect. "You've gone up at once in my estimation. I was very bad at mathematics. It's my, what do you call it, my Achilles' heel. Do you hear, Claudine? It seems Monsieur Geutegin is a mathematician. Well, monsieur student, show me your diploma certificates. What did you do well at?"

It was partly a joke, of course, but partly too he wanted to verify what I had said. Geutegin got out his diploma certificates, and Professor Leerlink thumbed through them, delightedly showing his wife the excellent marks and repeating: "Excellent. Excellent. Good. Excellent again."

That evening we got talking about Khabarovsk. I remembered that some of the works of my fellow countryman, the famous bone-carver Gemaugé, were in the museum there. Madame Leerlink started writing the name down in her notebook so as to remember to look at his work. But in writing down the unfamiliar name in French she made some mistakes. Geutegin, who was sitting



beside her, noticed this and began spelling it out to her : he gave each letter its French pronunciation. Madame Leerlink wrote it down and then asked quietly : " You know French, then ? "

" Oh, no ! " Geutegin was confused. " Very little."

" Don't be so modest," said the professor. " I saw your certificate myself : French—excellent." And once again he spread out his five fingers.\*

His wife blushed deeply and smiled, biting her lip not to burst out laughing. But she did laugh all the same, and so did we all, to cover our slight embarrassment. The professor was the last to join in. At first he couldn't understand why we were laughing. Then he kept on repeating : " Dear, dear, dear. And we spoke about you as if we were alone."

The fairytale beauty of Lake Baikal won the hearts of our companions. Even we, who had passed by its shores several times, could not tear ourselves away from the window. The mountain spurs, cut through by endless tunnels, the waves whipped by a light breeze, the sailing boats, the far mountain ranges. The water came right up to the embankment. At one of the stations a young officer from a neighbouring compartment borrowed a bucket from the attendant, ran down the bank and drew it up full of Baikal water. The whole coach drank from it. From one compartment after another rose the old song *Wonderful sea, holy Baikal*.

Professor Leerlink drank Baikal water, bought smoked fish from Buryat fishermen at the stations, and wrote the words of the Baikal song in his notebook. When he came to the mention of the Barguzin† wind he asked : " Who was Barguzin ? " His wife looked out of the window and sighed : " I'd like to spend the whole summer here with my easel."

By now we were fairly near Khabarovsk, and our journey together was drawing to an end. The professor asked us to pose for his wife. They wanted to have some sketches at least, as a memento of the time we had spent together. There was no reason to refuse, though we were a bit put out, in a way, at the thought of ending up in the collection of curios. *These are deer—these are walruses—and these are Chukchi*.

Geutegin said : " Of course. But on one condition. Will you let me take your photograph, as a souvenir ? "

He took his camera from his suitcase and photographed them in the square at Yerofei-Pavlovich station.

Madame Leerlink then sketched us. Each of us had to become a statue for half an hour or so. While I was posing, Geutegin gave a demonstration in mimicry of how Madame Leerlink would show our portraits to her friends in Liège and regale them with stories of reindeer rides and polar bear hunts.

" But our friends all know," she laughed, " they all know we weren't going to the Arctic Circle. Leningrad is the northernmost point of our whole trip."

" That doesn't matter. You might have had second thoughts. You got an invitation from two young Chukchi you met on your journey from Moscow to Khabarovsk. And one of them gave you a tame seal as a souvenir."

" How could I get away with that ? My friends would insist on seeing it."

" You can say that on the way back the seal pined for the north and fell ill. You had to have it shot, and you got it made into a fur waistcoat. You can get a sealskin waistcoat in Khabarovsk to show your friends. Remember to tear off the factory tab, though."

Geutegin had clearly got quite used to our companions. He was pulling

---

\* Highest mark in Soviet examinations is five—" excellent."—Ed.

† An east wind which blows on Lake Baikal. The settlement of Barguzin, on the river of that name (which flows into Lake Baikal) was a place of exile under the Tsars ; which gave rise to the song.—Ed.

their legs as if he were in a student's hostel among his classmates. He was very funny, but every time I started laughing Madame Leerlink said I was ruining her drawing. Still, she did manage to get the portraits done, and I thought them both quite successful.



ON the last day, when we were very nearly at Khabarovsk, the professor and Geutegin got out of hand and started arguing again. This time they couldn't see eye to eye on group marriage. The professor was saying that the disappearance of this custom, which had existed in Chukotka up to the establishment of the Soviet system, could not be more than an administrative formality.

"Changes don't come about so quickly," he said. "Especially in matters of this kind. It takes generations. Children—what is the proverb?—Children take after the old block. The whole concept of love would have to alter. That doesn't happen in such a short time. I can't believe it. You may forbid group marriage, but you can't teach people how to feel."

Geutegin modestly assured the professor that the Chukchi had known how to feel even before, and that the concept of love in Chukotka was the same as elsewhere. He explained that group marriage had died out simply because the whole social structure had changed, and that forms of marriage were closely linked with the whole life of society. In short, he told the professor a few simple facts; but the professor kept on insisting.

"No, no. Such things don't change all at once. Not so soon."

"But which of us knows best, monsieur professor? You who have never been farther north than Leningrad, or we, who were brought up in Chukotka and know that this custom has disappeared, along with a lot of other survivals of clan structure? You say it has come about too quickly? I should say so! That was just our people's good luck! That's just the point—we have stepped into socialism straight from primitive society, from the darkness of a most savage life, bypassing whole social formations, including, if you will forgive me, the one you are still living in, professor."

I don't know how the argument would have finished if Madame had not taken a hand. She declared that she knew nothing about social formations and that sort of thing, but that since the argument turned on the matter of love she was prepared to be the judge. "Only women," she said, "know what love is."

She said that the practice of group marriage was incompatible with real feeling. We fully agreed with her. Then she declared that the custom had existed in Chukotka because generally speaking northerners did not know real feeling.

"You mustn't be angry with me," she said, smiling sweetly. "There's no need to be offended. Anyone living so far away—it's all so cold, there's ice everywhere around—it isn't possible to love so ardently. For that, you need a heart of a different sort."

And since Chukotka is still in the north, as it was before, then, Madame argued: "Maurice is right; you can't stamp the custom out."

Even the professor was taken aback by this conclusion.

"No, Claudine," he said. "I must reject that kind of support. The north has got nothing to do with it. Group marriage used to exist even in the tropics. That's not at all what I meant."

But Geutegin, for some reason very pleased, said: "Since you have denied men the right to judge as regards love, I fall back on the evidence of two young women. One of them saw my friend off in Leningrad, and the

other will be meeting me in Anadyr. I assure you, madame, that neither of them would agree with you as to the northerner's feelings."

I think that was our last dispute. The dark waters of the Amur were already to be seen. Some passengers were already assembling at the exit by our compartment. It was time to say goodbye. Our companions took leave of us in a very friendly way, with great and obvious sincerity. We replied in the same spirit. Before shutting up my case, I took from it a book in Chukchi and gave it to them. It was some of Pushkin's poems in my own translation. The present seemed to give them great pleasure.

"I think this will be the first book in Chukchi in the whole of Belgium," said the professor.

"And autographed by the author, too," exclaimed his wife.

"No," I corrected her. "Only the translator."

Geutegin and I picked up our cases, shook hands again and went out into the corridor, promising to send them a porter. When we had done this and we were walking along the platform, Geutegin said: "You see! And you wanted to escape to another compartment, if you remember."

"And do you suppose they understand everything you've been trying to explain to them in the last ten days?"

"Yes, of course. A lot of it anyway, if not everything. That's something. You said yourself that we had to make allowances for where they've come from. When all's said and done, their country is a whole historical epoch behind ours."

Just then I saw the professor and his wife again. They were sitting in a taxi. They saw us too, and we waved to one another.

They went to the Amur Hotel. They were going to spend three days sightseeing in Khabarovsk, and then they were going to Moscow by plane, and from Moscow home to Liège.

We went straight to the ticket office. We had taken tickets to Vladivostock in Leningrad, and they had to be endorsed. From Vladivostock there was a long journey facing us via the Sea of Japan, the Okhotsk Sea and the Behring Straits. Geutegin was going to Anadyr for his practical, and I was to go, directly there was an opportunity, still farther north from Anadyr—to the shores of the Chukotsk Sea, to my native settlement, "Morning"—the famous hunters' co-operative, where my father lives, and the old hunter Memyi, and the carver Gemaug, the collective farm mechanic Kelevgi, and Inryn and Keniri and Gemalkot. In thought I was there with them already. In my mind's eye I saw myself going down the street of the collective farm and catching sight of the teacher, Valentina Alexeyevna, through the school window, and my little black-eyed sister Tuar saying her lesson. I could see in the window of the next class my old friend the teacher Eines, writing something on the black-board: and by the shore itself, where the waves were scattering pebbles on the wet sand, three young hunters, Unpener, Rintuvgi and someone else, were loading up their whale boat and getting ready to put out to sea.

*Russian translation from the Chukot by A. SMOLYAN.*

*English translation by DAVID FRY.*

*From OGONYOK, No. 12, March 1953.*

---

# SERGEI SERGEYEVICH PROKOFIEV

1891-1953

Born in the Ukraine, April 11, 1891.

Died in Moscow, March 4, 1953.

S

PROKOFIEV was, by general consent, one of the great figures of twentieth-century music, on which he exerted a decisive influence.

His individuality as a composer and his virtuosity as a pianist had revealed itself already before the Revolution, winning the admiration of Gorky and Mayakovsky. To this period belong the *Scythian Suite*, *Classical Symphony* and the *First Violin Concerto*, which are not only significant works in themselves, but are also of considerable importance to the development of European music in that they reaffirmed classical principles of clarity of language which the domination of German romanticism had obscured. Above all, they asserted a positive attitude to life in which satire played an important but not a dominating role.

From 1918 to 1932 Prokofiev travelled extensively throughout Europe, Asia and America as a virtuoso pianist, Paris becoming his artistic home. To this period belong the opera *Love of Three Oranges* (of which the march is still frequently played) and several ballets commissioned by Diaghilev.

In 1932 he returned to the Soviet Union, an event of great significance in his development. Prokofiev had never been an enemy of the Soviet Union and had never allowed himself to be identified with émigré Russian musicians in Paris. (The ballet *Le Pas d'Acier* had been concerned with building a new life in a Soviet village.) And he had never been an exponent of abstract art. His belief in the significance of melodic invention had never deserted him, although opinions may differ on the extent to which his melodic ideas were based on his native folk-song. It is unwise to attribute any special significance to the relatively small number of works he produced during his Paris days ; his extensive activity as a pianist can easily explain that. It is not surprising that a composer of Prokofiev's imagination and power should discover the necessity of finding his roots in his own people if he was to develop his expression to its full maturity. I have not had the opportunity of reading his own statements on the significance of his return to his

own country. This event did, however, herald the return of the fluency of his 1914 to 1918 period.

Hitherto his finest achievement had been in instrumental forms, but with his return to the USSR he developed mastery of the chorus and became influenced by the great Russian tradition, particularly Mussorgsky. His cantata *Alexander Nevsky*, based on the music he wrote for Eisenstein's film, reveals this quality with special vividness. The fun and high spirits of his earlier work developed into a joyousness that can now be recognised as characteristically Soviet. Soviet composers have told me that their greatest desire is to find musical articulation of the optimism of Soviet life. Prokofiev succeeded in achieving this expression.

It is not surprising that many critics in the West prefer Prokofiev's earlier, satirical works to those of his maturity, just as they prefer the tortured Bartok of his middle period to the beautiful *Violin Concerto* of his last period ; this preference is usually explained in terms of a falling-off in quality of thought and by suggesting, in the case of Prokofiev, that it is due to interference by politicians. But that which some critics condemn as a "falling-off", others would recognise as a deepening and enriching of powers of expression. The popularity of his ballets *Cinderella* and *Romeo and Juliet* is not indicative of an artist's decline or of "toeing the Party line", but rather that he has reached the hearts of his audience.

I am confident that greater familiarity with Prokofiev's last works, such as the *Second 'Cello Concerto*, will reveal them as those of a master at the height of his powers

BERNARD STEVENS



## **A TRADE UNION GROUP AT WORK**

**Tamara Timoshina**

---

EVERY twenty workers in a Soviet factory elect a trade-union group-organiser (comparable in some ways with a British shop-steward, except that there is only one union in each Soviet factory, and consequently group-organisers in the same factory represent members of the same union). There are hundreds of thousands of trade-union group-organisers: each of them has, as helpers in particular branches of work, a social insurance delegate, a cultural organiser, and a public inspector of labour protection, similarly elected. All four of these basic trade-union representatives are voluntary and unpaid, i.e. "activists"; they are usually assisted by other active trade-unionists in their group not elected for any particular function. Above the group there is the shop or departmental committee of the trade union, and above that the factory or works trade union committee.

The article which follows, translated from the daily newspaper of the Soviet trade unions, describes the work of one such group-organiser, in the eighth section of No. 4 Mechanical Assembly Shop of the Stalin Auto Works, Moscow. Tamara Timoshina, author of the article, is a skilled machine-tool operator and trade-union group-organiser. About a fortnight after this report was published, Timoshina reported on her work at a meeting of the Presidium of the Engineering Workers' Union Executive. After a very detailed discussion, it was decided to ask all works committees to study Timoshina's experience and apply it, and to call a Moscow aggregate meeting of trade-union group-organisers. Timoshina and her colleagues Bakshina, Ugarova and Kudentsova were awarded certificates of honour.

These were presented at a conference of about 1,000 trade-union group-organisers of Moscow engineering works on May 8, at which Timoshina's report was discussed in the light of their own experiences. On May 22 she spoke at a similar meeting in Leningrad.—*Ed.*



OUR work-team consists of twenty-one people, all of them young girls, and quite a number of them members of the Communist League of Youth. They are friendly, energetic and full of bounce. You could turn mountains over with them. Still, when the machine-tool operators elected me trade-union group-organiser, I was worried at first. Could I manage the job? It meant answering for the whole group. "You'll manage," said party group organiser Rybkin.

“The main thing is, try and keep the group together. Your strength is in its active members.”

The shop committee helped us trade-union organisers to start with. The chairman, Khotetovsky, held a briefing meeting for us and explained our duties in detail. He underlined that our main task was to develop socialist emulation in every possible way; and the principle of emulation, as Stalin taught us, is to help those who are lagging behind to catch up with the best, and thus get better results for everybody.

### *Nina Artyomova becomes a Stakhanovite*

Nina Artyomova joined us about a year ago. She came straight from school. She had only seen complex machinery like ours before at the pictures. To begin with she was attached to a skilled turner, Nina Minakova. Artyomova proved a capable pupil. After a few days she began machining parts herself. The chargehand said she would go a long way. But just when she had to be trained a little more, there was an urgent order, and Minakova was shifted to another section. Artyomova began working on her own.

One week goes by, then another. The chargehand seems to have forgotten our new mechanic. I notice that things are not going too well with Artyomova; but she keeps quiet. Maybe, I think, she is having just accidental difficulties. So I keep quiet too, and pretend not to notice anything—why worry a person for nothing? Only one day I come back from dinner, and I see Nina standing by her machine, face all red, tears in her eyes, and newly made parts lying in the box. I guess that she hasn't been to dinner and has been working instead. I go up to her and ask what has happened.

“Nothing's right,” she said. “My quota is 920 nuts per shift, and I can't make more than 700. Either it's the tool that breaks, or the part flies out . . . I'm sure I'll never make a turner.”

“Now don't you be in a hurry to draw conclusions,” I say. “You just tell me this: why haven't you asked for help before? Would the chargehand refuse? Besides, we other turners wouldn't leave you without help.”

“It isn't right for me to worry you with such questions. The chargehand praised me, and now look . . .” At that she burst into tears. I got quite sorry for her. But I gave no sign! On the contrary, I gave her a talking to for not asking for advice. Then I said: “Show me how you put the part in.”

I looked and could see right away that she was clamping the part wrongly and moving the carriage too jerkily, no wonder the tool used to break. I explained the mistake as well as I could. Later on I found a free minute again, went up to her lathe and showed her how to clamp the part. We had several more talks. She calmed down and things went a little better. But I could see that she was a long way off being perfect. What you need in such cases is not advice from time to time but constant training. I discussed it with the chargehand, and asked our Stakhanovites:

“Girls, who will undertake to help Nina Artyomova? She needs it.” We have this system: our skilled women workers take individual charge of the new girls if they wish. We always find volunteers. It was the same this time. “Let me do it,” said turner Paulina Konyukhova. “We're quite friendly, and I'll be able to help her better than the others.”

No one objected. Konyukhova began regularly staying behind after the shift with Artyomova, explaining to her in detail how to grind the cutting-tool, showing her the new ideas she was applying herself, demonstrating how she managed her machine. This training lasted ten days, maybe a fortnight. And the result was a good one—Nina began to fulfil her quota. Then the day came when in one shift she machined 970 nuts, fifty more than the quota. After the shift our activists stayed behind in the shop, and drew and hung up a placard:

GREETINGS TO NINA ARTYOMOVA  
FOR FULFILLING HER QUOTA 105%

Next morning I come in, and Nina rushes up, all blushing and eyes shining.

“What does this mean?” she says. “I’ve done nothing special. If it was Ugarova or Kudentsova—they do 180% of the quota . . .”

“Ugarova and Kudentsova have their names up on the Board of Honour of our shop,” say I, “and your first success didn’t come easily either.”

After this Artyomova began to try still harder. We saw to it that she shouldn’t stop her training. After the shift she went on remaining behind with Konyukhova, learning from her experience. One day Nina Ugarova, who is our social inspector for protection of labour, noticed that things were not tidy round her machine. At our request the chargehand had a special talk with her on how to keep the workplace in order. Gradually, bit by bit, Nina was acquiring experience and industrial skill . . .

This was all a few months ago. The other day Nina comes up to me and says: “Tamara, I want to join the Komsomol. Do you think they’ll have me?” I replied: “Well, you’re quite right, you’re a Stakhanovite now, you’re carrying out your quota 150%, you take an interest in public activities. I can give you my recommendation.”

At the meeting where her application was discussed there were many members of our work-team. We recalled how at first things wouldn’t go right and how she didn’t believe she could ever become a skilled machine-tool operator. We remembered all this and joined with her in being glad of her successes. After all, it was our common effort that had trained up an excellent worker who knew her job.

### *Kopeks and Seconds*

WE have a setter-up in our section, Klavdia Alexeyevna Inshakova. She has been several years in industry and knows her work. She could be fully employed passing on her experience to the young people, teaching them to be skilled workers. But whether she is made that way, or was plain lazy, she acted as slowly and unconcernedly as if she were not standing by a machine but sitting at home drinking tea. The girls would shout: “Klava, quick! My machine has gone out of order, I’m held up.”

“My, what a hurry you’re in,” she replies. “Wait a bit. There’s no hurry. Ten minutes won’t make all that difference.”

We activists talked to Inshakova more than once, but it was no good. You go and see her, start talking about hold-ups, and she replies: “And who are you to give me orders? About a week in the factory, and setting up as a teacher! I know what I have to do.”

We see that you can’t get anywhere by talking to Inshakova; so I go for advice to the chargehand. “I’ve noticed a long time ago,” he says, “that Inshakova isn’t trying very hard. I’ve made remarks to her, but it doesn’t help. I’ll have to issue a reprimand . . .”

I didn’t like this idea. A reprimand is easy. But couldn’t we act some other way? We remembered that in a few days’ time there would be a production conference. That was the place to talk about our uninterested machine-setter. I had a talk with the activists, and they approved the idea too. We made serious preparations for the conference, collected materials, thought over the methods of work of some of our machine-tool operators, made the necessary calculations. When it was my turn to speak, I began describing things as they were:

"Lately we were drawing up the results of socialist emulation, and found out that everyone was overfulfilling the quota. We were all pleased—what a good section! And it seemed as though we were making use of all the reserves, there was nothing more to fight for. But is that really so? The Nineteenth Party Congress decided to reduce costs of production in industry about 25% during the five years. That means we must all introduce the strictest economy in production. But how do we economise? Take drilling-machine operator Zubaryova, for example. In one week, through carelessness, she broke three drills. Well, each drill costs three roubles."

I looked round and saw that the girls were listening attentively. I took another peep at my paper and went on:

"It also happens that we use up more metal than we should, or spoil a valuable tool through inexperience or carelessness. But the biggest losses are those of time; and they take place most often through Inshakova. The other day, for example, she spent an hour and a half setting up Vezovkina's milling machine, when it could be done in twenty minutes. So more than a hour was wasted. Inshakova thinks this a trifle; yet in an hour Vezovkina could have machined twenty links. And how many 'trifles' like this does Inshakova lose?"

Directly I finished, Alexandra Belokurova, one of our turners, took the floor. She is a real character, always speaks first and always has something practical to say.

"Our collective undertook to fulfil its five-year plan ahead of schedule. That's why we count the time in seconds and worry about kopeks. We know that seconds add up into hours and kopeks into roubles. But Inshakova evidently doesn't worry about that; she's a woman who does things on a grand scale: You've lost an hour, what a trifle! You've lowered quota fulfilment by 10%, why worry? Can't she realise how this harms production? Let's put it down in the resolution: Inshakova isn't worried about output and drags the work-team backward!"

Then the others began—Nina Yermissova, Valya Pakhomova, Maria Kudentsova. Then the chargehand had a word to say. Our Klavdia Alexeyevna was quite red by this time, sitting quietly in the corner. When the conference was coming to an end, she asked to speak: "This talk has not been wasted on me, comrades. I promise that I won't repeat my mistakes."

It turned out a good conference. We had a real good talk, discussed like managers what reserves we had for fulfilling the five-year plan ahead of time, where and what we could economise in production. We decided that we could cut down expenditure on power and tools and completely wipe out lost time. Stakhanovites Bakshina, Kudentsova and Ugarova had a good idea: they proposed setting up a metal economy team. In a short time the team worked out five rationalisation proposals which will enable us to economise a hundred tons of metal a year. In February and March we already saved the State a considerable sum. Our setter-up, Inshakova, played her part too in this success.

### *On Persistence*

RECENTLY our work-team was given the job of machining a large order for brackets; but for some reason they gave us no packing material for them. Our operator would make the bracket and throw it down on the floor by the machine. In a short time all the passages were piled up with brackets. The shop became uncomfortable and crowded; but it wasn't the discomfort. During the shift the girls would sometimes leave their machines for a moment to go to the stores or the chargehand, and if they were in a hurry they stumbled right and left. Nina Ugarova saw this and was furious: "This is a scandal! I shall demand that it be put right immediately."

She is our elected labour-protection inspector, and I must say that she takes the work to heart. She won't let a single thing go by. First thing in the morning you hear her ringing voice in the section : "Yermissova, why aren't you wearing your protective goggles ? You may get your eye hurt by a filing." Or during the day, at the dinner break, she is already in the shop committee. "When are these departmental doors going to be mended ? There's a draught in here, enough to give everyone a cold." In the evening, when the shift is done, she hurries to the works health centre : "Will you organise a lecture in our section on how to fight 'flu ?"

In short, Nina is an energetic girl, always fighting and never done. But this time the irresistible force met an immovable body. The chargehand hurriedly listened to her talk about the need to clear away the brackets and waved her aside : "It doesn't matter if they stay there. Let the girls look where they're going."

So Ugarova goes to the technician, Kursky. He wouldn't even listen to her properly. "Brackets ? That's the sort of trifle you worry about. Let them lie a week or two, we'll clear them away later on." Ugarova came to me for advice. We thought and thought, and decided to go together to the section chief, Borofkov. We talked to him and explained what we wanted. "The technician is right, there are more important things to do just now," he replied. "In two or three days we'll see that you get the packing material."

So we waited. Two or three days passed and nothing happened. We went to complain to the shop committee. But the chairman of the committee, Khotetovsky, says : "I can't do anything just now. Wait."

Here I must say, to be quite frank, I was ready to give up. Evidently, I thought, there really was no means of getting the brackets cleared away just now, and was it worth while spending all this time over the question, distracting people from their work and worrying the shop committee ? In the long run it wasn't such an important case. I said this to Ugarova, but she replied : "What do you mean, not worth while ? So long as these brackets are lying about in the passages, someone may get hurt. How can things be left like that ? I'm going to the shop manager."

I even tried to persuade her not to go, assuring her that the shop manager, Stolyarov, had probably heard of our request a long time ago and if he had the means would long since have given us the packing material. But it was no use. We nearly quarrelled, but she still insisted on her point. As soon as the shift began, off she goes to Stolyarov alone. I was busy at the time with something else.

Next morning I come into the shop and there are the workmen clearing away the brackets. I went to Nina : "Did you really manage it ?"

"Can't you use your eyes ?" she says. "And we'll have the packing material today. And you said it was a waste of time ! How can you treat people's health that way, you . . . liberal ?"

I was hurt, but I kept quiet. Besides, what could I say ? Nina was right. I made up my mind then once and for all : without real persistence you can't be successful.

### *No Worry about the Children*

ONE morning, Anna Khromova, a drilling-machine operator, comes up to me and says : "I spent last night at Andreyeva's. Yesterday, after the shift, I heard she had fallen ill and been sent to hospital. She's got children. We must see that they're looked after."

In our collective that's our rule : if any of the women falls ill, we make a practice of visiting her, ask about her health, tell her what's new at the works. Anna Khromova is the most frequent visitor. She's our insurance delegate.



Maria Andreyeva has several small children. One daughter Lilia is in the fifth class, her boy Alik in the second, and the younger boy, Vitia, only recently started going to kindergarten. They need looking after. You can't leave them alone a single night. Andreyeva lives a long way away, at Kolomenskaya, a good hour's journey from the works. In a word, more worry for the trade-union group. I had a talk with Khromova, but realised that she alone could not cope with it.

The same day, after the shift, Anya and I collected the activists—Klavdia Bakshina, our cultural organiser, Nina Ugarova, our labour-protection inspector, and the Stakhanovites Maria Kudentsova, Nina Yermissova and Assya Stroilova. We began discussing how best to arrange care of Andreyeva's children. Ugarova says :

"True enough, you can't leave them all alone. Let's take turns in spending the night at her place." On that we agreed, and drew up a roster. All of us took our turn. We did what was necessary in the house. The children got quite used to us and were waiting for us every evening. Everything went well.

We went to the hospital, too. The shop trade-union committee gave us cash to buy her presents. We bought fruit and chocolate. I remember how, the first time we entered the ward, Andreyeva sat up in bed and said straight away : "Do you happen to know, girls, how things are at home ? I'm worried about the children, quite worn out." Anya Khromova calmed her down : "No need to worry, Maria Yevdokimovna. Everything's all right at home." We gave her our presents, and she started thanking Anya Khromova. But really there was no call for thanks ; we were simply doing our job as activists.

### *At the Works Committee*

I WAS warned that in February the works committee would be discussing the experience of our trade-union group. I prepared my report for the meeting with Bakshina and Ugarova and Stakhanovites Belokurova and Stolbushkina. It was a pretty detailed report ; yet when I was called upon to speak I felt a bit uncertain. Was our experience really worth a special discussion ?

I described how socialist emulation is organised in our section. Our collective has achieved good results in the battle to fulfil our five-year plan ahead of time. Output has increased 32.7% in one year, productivity by 27%. All the machine-tool operators are overfulfilling their quotas, and the majority are turning out only excellent quality output. I described how labour conditions are being improved, mentioned our fifteen excursions, four ski-ing expeditions, twenty group bookings at the theatre and cinema, and a lot more. It was difficult to get everything in.

There was a lively discussion. Members of the works committee and chairmen of shop committees spoke. They noted and praised us for our good work, but also talked about our failings. Here, at the works committee session, I realised that we had much that was incomplete and many errors. We do little to bring into the public eye those who are best in socialist emulation. We usually discuss only production questions at meetings of our trade-union group. Foreman Olyenev is not always attentive to the problems raised by the workers, particularly those newly arrived, and we activists take this too lightly.

"The activists of our foremost trade-union group will, of course, take steps to eliminate these defects," said Gruzintsev, the chairman of our works committee. "But we too have a lot to put right in our work, because the shop committee and the works committee as well have their responsibility for the failings in the section. It must be admitted that lately we have let work with the activists slide. We must draw a lesson from the report of the trade-union group-organiser."

## V. I. PUDOVKIN

1893 - 1953

THE death of Vsevolod Illarionovich Pudovkin has deprived world cinema of one of its greatest pioneers and creative artists. He won world-wide fame in 1926 with his film version of Gorky's *Mother*, and sustained that fame with such Soviet classics as *The End of St. Petersburg*, *Storm Over Asia*, *Suvorov*, and so on. On his sixtieth birthday, in March 1953, he was awarded the Order of the Red Banner of Socialist Labour, almost simultaneously with the release of his last film, a colour version of G. Nikolayeva's prize-winning novel *Harvest*, entitled *The Return of Vasili Bortnikov*.

A fuller appreciation of his work will appear in a future issue.

See also his article *Stanislavsky's System in the Cinema*, in our Autumn 1952 issue (XIII, 3) and R. Parker's review of Mariamov's biography in our Winter 1951 issue (XII, 4), which also contains a complete list of his films up to that date.

*(Continued from page 32)*

The works committee approved the work of our group, and decided to make its experience generally available. The resolution adopted set out what had to be done to eliminate the defects.

Since then, a month has gone by. The other day we called a meeting to sum up the results of emulation in March, Turner Nina Artyomova—the same girl who not so long ago was still studying her trade—asked to speak. She said: "The collective of our section has carried out its month's programme 110%. It's not a bad result in itself, only we could do more. Today, when all the country is increasing its labour efforts, we ought to move ahead faster. I suggest we revise and increase our socialist undertakings."

The others supported her. We weighed things up, thought them over, and decided that in honour of May Day we would fulfil the April programme 111.5%, reduce consumption of tools 10%, and turn out only excellent quality output. Of course, these are serious undertakings, and we shall have quite a lot of difficulties; but we believe in our strength, because in everything we go ahead together and work as a team. And when one thinks of what goes on in our trade-union group, one sees our whole works and the whole country.

*From TRUD, April 10, 1953*

# PEOPLE WHO WOULD RATHER NOT MENTION LOVE

**M. Shmarova**

---

OUR party and government, our society, our literature and art have always attached great importance to the problem of educating man in the spirit of communist morality.

It is not man "in general", man in the abstract, that should be studied by our artists, but the living man with all his passions and thoughts, his actions and dreams, his qualities and faults, in great things and in small, in private and public life.

The subject of love, marriage and family is an important one. "Two people take part in love, and a third new life comes into being. It is here that social interest lies and where the duty towards the collective arises", V. I. Lenin said in a conversation with Clara Zetkin. The demand for a serious treatment of this theme is the demand of the party, the state and the people.

True to the best traditions of Russian classical and Soviet literature, Soviet cinematographic art has more than once posed and successfully dealt with the problem of love, family and marriage, as for instance in such films as *Mashenka*, *Komsomolsk*, *Member of the Government*, *The Teacher*, and so on.

In the post-war period, however, our cinematography has not merely made no progress as compared with the past, but has even lost much of its accumulated creative experience. In scenarios and films the theme of output is constantly substituted for that of love. Lovers more often than not talk only on subjects connected with output, and professions of love proceed more or less on the following lines :

*He* : You must forgive us, comrade engineer, but we really are obliged to let you know that we are uneasy about you.

*She* : What ?

*He* : You are single. As an engineer you are the head of the team, but as a woman you stand alone. It is not good, it is odd, and it should not be so in Soviet life.

*She* : But am I the only one ? Is it for ever ? (And so on and so forth.)

He is Alesha, she is Sasha, and the two are the principal characters in the film *The Road to Glory*.

To make it clear to the audience that this is the long-awaited declaration of love, a "decorated mechanic" approaches him and asks :

— Alesha !

— Ah ?

— Love, eh ?

Personal and public matters are of course closely linked, but in life the connection is far more complex. You cannot say to the man you love : "If you fulfil 100% of your norm I will love you", or "If you become a Stakhanovite coal miner I will marry you ; if not, find yourself another girl". To put such words into the mouth of the heroine of a play or a scenario is to adapt bourgeois conceptions of love and marriage to socialist conditions.

Characteristically enough, in making their characters profess this kind of philosophy the authors there and then fall into contradictions.

"How difficult it is, after all, to realise whether a man is good or bad", engineer Sasha says to her assistant Alesha in the same film. "And yet I do know! The true self is revealed in work. If you watch a man's attitude towards his job you can tell at once whether he is good or bad." Here, in company with the authors, she overlooks the fact that her first husband, Makagon, was a shock-worker and a Stakhanovite, but for all that an unattractive personality who gave her good reason for leaving him after less than a year of married life.

Over-simplification arises when the authors merely skim over the surface of things and, fearing difficulties, avoid showing life in all its complexity and contradictions. That is why in such films love is infinitely duller, more colourless and more insignificant than the most prosaic love in real life.

We do not mean to say, of course, that every film should give a full and broad picture of love and everyday life. What we do want is that when such subjects are treated it should be done with the greatest possible truth and vigour, with the greatest possible depth and inspiration.

What other feeling than that of impatience with the authors can be aroused in the audience by the following "picture" of the finest and most complex relations between two people in love with one another :

#### Frame 75

(Lieutenant-captain Orlov and the girl Lena are walking along the quay.)

Orlov : Lenchka ! Lena ! Aren't you going to say anything more to me today ?

Lena : Today not . . . I shall say nothing more.

Orlov : Nothing ?

#### Frame 605

(Orlov and Lena on the veranda.)

Orlov : Lenchka, aren't you going to tell me something today ?

Lena : Today ? Today I shall tell you all ! All !

As you see, there was no danger of us boring the reader by quoting the whole story of the relations between the two main characters of the film *In Time of Peace*, for these two scenes, one in the beginning, the other at the end of the film, exhaust "love". Throughout the rest of the film the hero and heroine go about their respective business without meeting one another.

One of the favourite literary heroes of our young people, the construction chief Batmanov in V. Azhiev's novel *Far from Moscow*, says in a conversation with Tania Vasilchenko : "I now begin to think more and more often about what is called private life. . . . It seems to me that much depends upon how a man's life starts, on whether he begins life with a great, real love."

It is this great, real love that has so far failed to become an accepted theme with our cinematographic art.

The rising cultural standards of the Soviet man raise his attitude towards love to higher levels. Art is called upon to educate man, by force of example, in all his manifestations and consequently also in such an intimate, such a deeply personal, feeling as love.

And yet what do many of our films try to teach us ? To treasure love as the greatest happiness ? Not to dissipate one's feelings by wasting them on trifles ? To see what is great and important beneath the shell of incidentals ? To avoid petty quarrels and to seek to shield one another from unnecessary hurts and suffering ? Not at all ! Most of our scenario writers and producers treat their characters in exactly the opposite way. They make lovers turn away from one another through mere misunderstandings, insult one another by mean suspicions and unfounded reproaches of infidelity.

What, for instance, clouded the love of Kazakova (in the film *Village Doctor*) for her Ivan Denisovich (why she fell in love with him is another matter) ? Why do they so lightly turn away from one another and meet for

a whole year "as mere acquaintances"? Or why (in the film *For the Sake of Life*) does Lena go and leave the man she loves at the most difficult moment of his life? Could she not explain to him that there would be time enough for her to study and that this was no time for them to part? After all, she would be doing this not merely for the sake of her love for him but also in the interests of the important work that he was now left to deal with entirely on his own.

Why does Vasia (in the film *Donets Miners*), whose impatient love for Lida demands from her professions of love in every scene, suddenly part so easily with his beloved when she becomes a student of the Mining Institute and cannot follow him to distant parts? Just because Vasia is "ashamed" to go to school in the place where they happen to be living. "Now you must decide, Lida, whether we go or not," he says to the girl he loves. Lida does not refuse at once, she is only astonished: "But it is all so sudden..." But Vasia makes up his mind at once: "All right... I see how it is... Goodbye then, Lida."

So lightly do the heroes of our films renounce their happiness! And how difficult their life together would probably be, if even before marriage, in friendship and love, they do not know how to respect one another, how to spare each other's feelings and help and educate one another.

A distinguishing feature of the Soviet family is that love, which is the foundation of marriage, is necessarily accompanied by a feeling of great inner responsibility for the loved one. Otherwise, how would Tatiana Alexandrovna Dobrotvorskaya (in the film *Tribunal of Honour*) have acted when she learnt that her husband, professor Dobrotvorsky, had behaved unpatriotically against the interests of the State by divulging a State secret? Should she have left him, or, like Nina Ivanovna Loseva, sought to enlist the support of influential friends? No. She was bound to act as she did, according to her conscience, as every genuinely loving wife would have done. She opened her husband's eyes and helped him to realise that he was at fault and that it was right that he should be tried. This she did with great tact yet with all the force of her convictions:

"Tonight, Alesha, is the most serious, the hardest night of our lives. I shall always be with you. After all, I know you better than anyone else does. Perhaps no one but me knows you as you are. Don't you realise that you are guilty and that it is right for them to try you?"

"You, my wife, say this to me?"

"Your loving wife."

And it is no accident, but quite logical, that Dobrotvorsky should begin his speech at the tribunal of honour with his wife's words: "A tribunal of honour is something after which either a man is born anew or he becomes an outcast." It was his wife and no one else that helped the new man to be born in him.

The loving wife, the best friend and comrade, becomes an active social force in the film. This is deeply true and lifelike.

Light and spacious is the life of the Soviet people. Freed from the power of bourgeois property, love brings to the Soviet man much happiness and life-asserting optimism, making him stronger and finer. Yet in our scenarios and films it is often dull and crude. On their way to happiness the heroes have to overcome so many external obstacles put up by the scenarist's generous hand that no room is left in the film for ordinary human happiness. Love does not ennoble the heroes, it does not inspire them, lend them wings; on the contrary, it tends to disintegrate and weaken their will-power.

A theme which has been dropped by our art and has become positively bad form is that of unrequited, unhappy love. Yet life has not dropped it,



and if it is no longer reflected in our films the responsibility lies with the artists. There are many who think it useless to try to sort out the feelings of a character when nothing can be done to help him and when there is no ready-made remedy to offer a man in his situation. Yet this is only a superficial impression. In real life things are much more serious. We cannot shut our eyes to what exists in real life, which to a greater or lesser degree inevitably affects the formation of a young man's character, bringing him pain and suffering. It is the task of the masters of Soviet cinematographic art to reflect the realities of life and the emotional experiences of human beings in all their fullness, their depth and their contradictory dramatic complexity.

At a conference of senior pupils of secondary schools of the Bauman district of Moscow, M. I. Kalinin said :

"Sometimes it happens like this : a pupil walks out with a girl, then he leaves her and starts walking out with another—and there you have a complete 'drama'. Do not think that I am speaking about this with the irony of an old man—I too have been young and today I respect the youthful emotions of others. What I am driving at is this : for one whose character is not yet determined and set such a 'drama' can take on too great an importance and create a deep disappointment in life in general, leaving a lasting bitterness."

Finally we must point out to our cinematographic art its failure to touch upon such extremely important aspects of life as the creation of the young Soviet family. Why does cinematography show love only at its most festive moments, only when the hero and heroine are still on the threshold of life's trials ? Why is there not a single film showing the everyday life of a young new family, in which conflicts are most likely to arise ? Why are the heroes of our films childless ? Is it indeed so easy to bring up and educate a new human being that the task deserves no attention ? Have we not fathers and mothers who injure their children both morally and physically, giving them wrong habits of mind, "bringing them up" as self-indulgent egotists, idlers and cads ? How can such things be neglected ?

By under-estimating the subject of love many of our artists have in the long run lost sight of a number of problems of primary social importance.

Yet it is particularly in problems of love, of family and of everyday life, which are not directly connected with the collective, that falling out of step is easiest. How often it happens that a man seems progressive at his job—he is a Stakhanovite, a social worker—yet at home behaves like an old-fashioned family tyrant, is selfish and rough, or else leads a frivolous existence. It must always be borne in mind that sooner or later such discrepancies must tell on his entire work and social behaviour, on his whole moral character.

The field of personal life should not be neglected. It is imperative to mobilise all the means of the cinematograph, including such genres as comedy and satire, with its deadly weapon of ridicule which can sear and destroy the remnants of bourgeois mentality, not only in public life but in private life too.

*From SOVETSKOYE ISKUSSTVO, May 6, 1953.*

*Translated by T. SHEBUNINA.*

**The author of this article is a student at the State Institute of Cinematography.**

# Book Reviews

## MARX AND ENGELS ON RUSSIA

**The Russian Menace to Europe.** Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. A collection of articles, speeches, letters and news dispatches selected and edited by Paul W. Blackstock and Bert F. Hoselitz. (Allen and Unwin, 1953: 20/-, pp. 288.)

**K. Marx i F. Engels o Rossii i russkom narode.** (K. Marx and F. Engels on Russia and the Russian people.) V. N. Kotov. (Izdatelstvo Znanie, Moscow, 1953: 90 kopeks.)

A COLLECTION of the writings of Marx and Engels about Russia, in English translation, with a scholarly commentary, would be welcomed by every student of Russian history. The first thing to be said about the work of Mr. Blackstock and Mr. Hoselitz must, unfortunately, be that it is not that book. It is, instead, a highly arbitrary selection from the works of Marx and Engels, which fails to give a rounded picture of what their views on and connections with Russia were and how these views and connections developed. This selection is accompanied, moreover, by a commentary which, for all its parade of bibliographical learning, adds little to our understanding of the subject and is in places downright misleading.

The principle on which the editors have made their selection from the voluminous writings of Marx and Engels relating to Russia is nowhere stated and is far from self-evident. On the one hand there are included such widely known documents as Engels's preface to the Russian edition of the *Communist Manifesto* (1882) and his essay *On Social Conditions in Russia* (1875), which are already available in the *Selected Works of Marx and Engels* in two volumes, published in English by the Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, in 1949 and 1950 (not mentioned by Mr. Blackstock and Mr. Hoselitz). On the other there are some ephemeral journalistic pieces of which it may well be true, as the editors claim, that they have never before been fully rendered into English. The ideas expressed in these articles are already familiar to a wide public from *Revolution and Counter-Revolution* (also published by Allen & Unwin), and they add nothing of substance to our knowledge of the views of Engels concerning the affairs of the Southern and Western Slavs, with which they mainly deal. These articles were briefly mentioned, and their essential content summarised, with quota-

tions, in Dona Torr's *Marxism, Nationality and War* (London, 1940)—again a work that is missing from the bibliography given by Mr. Blackstock and Mr. Hoselitz.

From the standpoint of the advancement of learning or from that of the popularisation of the ideas of Marx and Engels about Russia, there does not appear to be any clear justification for this book. If one considers it as a contribution to the "cold war", however, its point becomes obvious. As a handbook of quotations from the Marxist classics in which hard things are said about Russian Tsarism which unscrupulous politicians could "adapt" for use in propaganda against the USSR, the book may certainly serve a purpose of sorts. That this is indeed the market the editors have in view is plain from the introduction and notes which they supply. "Marx's analysis of the role of the Russian village community under decaying Tsarism applies with equal force to the role of the *kolkhoz* under Stalinism", they write (p. 23). The present regime in Russia is essentially the same as that which prevailed a hundred years ago and was denounced by Marx and Engels, we learn. "The argument that workers in Russia cannot be exploited because the factories 'belong to the workers themselves' is merely a semantic trick" (p. 20); and, should we have any further doubts on this point, Mr. Arthur Koestler is invoked as an authority on the "class structure" of contemporary Soviet society.

It is difficult, however, to see what purpose, even in the "cold war", is served by reminding the world that Engels at one time wrote of the Slovenes and Croats as "ethnic trash", peoples without a future; and most odd that the editors of *The Russian Menace to Europe* should reproach Soviet scholars for not doing more to bring these particular passages to the attention of the Soviet public. Were Soviet writers to dwell upon them, would this not be denounced as "psychological warfare" against Tito? In any case, to publish some of these articles of Engels's out of context (without, for example, also publishing Marx's article of June 17, 1848, in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, showing how the Germans had driven the Slavs into the arms of Russian Tsarism by their oppressions, and without providing the reader with some account, however brief, of the actual course of events in Central Europe in 1848-49), is to make Marx and Engels appear more one-sided than they really were in their attitude to the German-Slav

conflicts of their day, and to conceal the causes that gave rise to their opinions.

Even from this extremely partial and unrepresentative selection from their writings we can glimpse the penetrating analysis by Marx and Engels of the international role of Tsarism in the 1840s and 1850s and their interest in the social changes that began in Russia following her defeat in the Crimean War. It is astonishing that so much wisdom shows through even in the hurried newspaper articles, products of sweated journalism, which Mr. Blackstock and Mr. Hoselitz have been at such pains to disinter. One wonders whether Senator MacCarthy will thank them, however much he may sympathize with their general intention, for securing wider publicity for such propositions as "A people which oppresses another cannot emancipate itself" (p. 115), or that national sovereignty "is the basic condition of every healthy and free development" (p. 117). Marx's account of how greed for Polish territory contributed to the ruin of German democracy in 1848 could be held to be as relevant to present-day problems as anything else in the book. And who knows but that the idea running through the majority of these articles, of one Great Power acting as "gendarme of reaction" throughout the world, and deserving to be opposed by democrats and patriots everywhere, may give rise to comparisons and parallels in readers' minds quite different from what the editors intended?

There is one prominent feature of the commentary which calls for particular discussion and reply. The publisher's note on the dust-cover declares: "It is hardly known now how anti-Russian and anti-Slav were Marx and Engels. In Russia their collected works have now been withdrawn and much of their writings suppressed or 'reinterpreted'." The editors themselves write (p. 12): "With one or two exceptions the essays contained in this volume are not only unavailable in Russia, but their publication and distribution could be achieved only by illegal means . . ." "The writings of Marx and Engels on Russia—with very few exceptions—cannot be published in Russia . . ." they assert (p. 17).

Nowhere do the editors specify which works of Marx and Engels they allege to be "suppressed" in the USSR. The nearest they come to precision in this respect is when, after quoting a passage from Marx's *Secret Diplomatic History of the Eighteenth Century*, they state (p. 14) that "the present regime in Russia has done everything in its power to ignore or obliterate these writings". It was an unfortunate example to take; the book by Nikiforov on Anglo-Russian relations in the reign of Peter the Great, which was published in 1950 and was reviewed in the last issue of

the *ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL*, contains seven references to passages in the *Secret Diplomatic History*! On p. 259 the charge of "withdrawal" and "suppression" is whittled down to a claim that certain volumes of Marx and Engels "have become quite rare"; the editors would have been wiser to stick throughout to this formulation, which can mean almost anything.

To anyone even slightly familiar with current Russian historical literature, the allegations made by Mr. Blackstock and Mr. Hoselitz that in the Soviet Union the writings of Marx and Engels are suppressed must appear singularly impudent. The bibliography to Tarle's well-known history of the Crimean War, for example (*Krymskaya voyna*, 2nd edition, 1950), includes all the articles about the war which are printed in Volumes IX and X of the Russian edition of the works of Marx and Engels but which Mr. Blackstock and Mr. Hoselitz present as though they were contraband. It is indeed rare nowadays for a Soviet writer on nineteenth-century history not to acknowledge and draw his readers' attention to the writings of the founders of Marxism that relate to his subject, with precise references to volume and page of their collected works; and one had even become accustomed to this practice being made in the West a matter of reproach against Soviet historians!

In addition to the publication of the complete writings of Marx and Engels in the numerous volumes of the *Sochinenia* (Works) and the *Arkiv Marksa i Engelsa* (Marx-Engels Archive), a number of special selections from these writings have been published in the USSR. There is, for instance, the *Selected Works* in two volumes, already mentioned. This contains, among other things, Engels's article of 1884 on *Marx and the Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, mentioning that part of Marx's policy in 1848-49 was the waging of a revolutionary war against Tsarist Russia; the *Inaugural Address* of the First International, with its reference to "that barbarous power whose head is at St. Petersburg"; and the First Address of the International on the Franco-Prussian war, which warns against "the dark figure of Russia" looming behind the contending powers. There is also a selection about which it is even more surprising that Mr. Blackstock and Mr. Hoselitz have nothing to say—*Perepiska K. Marksa i F. Engelsa s russkimi politicheskimi deyatelyami* (Correspondence of K. Marx and F. Engels with Russian Politicians), of which a second, enlarged edition appeared in 1951. This contains 94 letters by Marx and Engels and 110 letters to them, the correspondents including Lopatin, Vera Zasulich, Plekhanov and others, and a very wide range of aspects of Russian politics and social life being covered. The letters are printed as

they were written, and the editor points out in his introduction that Engels's views on Russia's role in international politics in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, as reflected in some of these letters, were criticised by Stalin in 1934. (A translation of Stalin's article appeared in the London *Labour Monthly* of August 1952.)

The fact that Marx and Engels were hostile to Tsarist Russia is mentioned in the text-books used in Soviet schools where this is necessary for the understanding of historical events. For example, A. M. Pankratova, in her *Istoria SSSR* (History of the USSR) for secondary schools (1952 edition), notes in her chapter on the Crimean War that, besides Britain, France, etc., "finally, the Russian Tsar had yet another foe—European democracy, which saw in Russian Tsarism an international gendarme and the main obstacle in the path of European progress".

The complete absence of any survey, however cursory, of the Russian editions of Marx and Engels, in a book containing bald statements about the "withdrawal" and "suppression" of these works in the USSR, is, indeed, one of the most striking features of *The Russian Menace to Europe*. The reader is not even told of the guide to these editions published in 1948 in Moscow by Goskultprosvetizdat, the publishing house which produces handbooks of all kinds for librarians and other organisers of cultural activities—*Bibliografiia proizvedenii K. Marksa i F. Engelsa* (Bibliography of the works of K. Marx and F. Engels), by A. A. Levin. One can only speculate as to the reasons for this failure to follow normal scientific practice. Space which could have been allotted to the giving of such references as would help the reader to check the validity of the editors' allegations is occupied by the editors' opinions on problems of world history. For example, they state that "... in the battle between Napoleonic France and Czarist Russia the former represented a revolutionary progressive ideology and the latter a tyrannical authoritarianism..." What a pity that their concern to popularise the historical views of Engels did not run to quoting *his* opinion on the matter: "Napoleon, alleged to be the representative of the bourgeois revolution, was in reality a despot in his own country and a conqueror in relation to neighbouring peoples."

As is usual in books of this kind, the Russian word for "objectivism" is mis-translated (p. 265) as "objectivity." Among errors that have no obvious political significance, one may note that the words "too much" on p. 217 are the editors' rendering of "trop peu" in the French original, and that Engels's article *On Social Conditions in Russia* was written in 1875 and not in 1873 as stated in the book. The Cambridge mentioned in the footnote on p. 20 is of course

Cambridge, Mass., not Cambridge, England.

It is pleasant to turn from the foregoing to the pamphlet by the Soviet historian V. N. Kotov. This is the text of two lectures given under the auspices of the adult education organisation called the All-Union Society for the Dissemination of Political and Scientific Knowledge. Kotov mentions (giving references to the *Sochinenia*) the judgment of Marx and Engels that from the time of the French Revolution onward Russian Tsarism functioned as the "stronghold of European reaction", and that even though, after the Crimean War, its weight in international affairs declined, its foreign policy remained a reactionary force. But he also points out that "Marx and Engels knew and studied two Russias—the reactionary Russia of the gentry and bourgeoisie, and the revolutionary Russia of the peasants and workers"; and he devotes most of his space to showing the interest that the founders of Marxism took in Russian history, Russian literature and the Russian language, and their close connection with a number of Russian democrats and socialists. Of particular interest is their estimate of Chernyshevsky and their influence on Lopatin's plan to rescue him from Siberian exile.

Kotov draws extensively upon the notebooks and other MSS of Marx and Engels which have been published by the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute, as well as upon their private correspondence. It becomes obvious how unbalanced a picture of the views of Marx and Engels on Russia is obtained if one ignores these sources and confines one's attention to their public writings, which were necessarily much influenced by tactical and polemical considerations. (See, for example, the important observation by Engels in his letter to Marx dated May 23, 1851: "Russia... is really progressive in relation to the East... Russian domination is a civilising element on the Black Sea, the Caspian Sea and in Central Asia and among the Bashkirs and Tatars...")

A specially interesting feature of Kotov's pamphlet is his account of the publication of the works of Marx and Engels in Russia and the dissemination of their ideas by Russian socialists both inside their own country and also in the Balkan lands (acknowledged by Engels in his *Letter to Bulgarian Social-Democrats*, which Kotov quotes).

BRIAN PEARCE

## CAUCASIAN HISTORY

*Studies in Caucasian History.* V. Minorsky. (Valentine, Mitchell, 1953: 35/-.)

LET me first express in a word the pleasure I feel in responding to the request



of the English friends who have asked me to review Minorsky's new book here, first of all because they are devoting themselves to a task to which I fear we in France cannot offer a contribution as felicitous as theirs, and secondly because the author of the book is one of those most worthy, both as a scholar and as a man, of being known to the readers of this journal. Too many orientalist are either connected with the colonialists or given to forms of oriental history that are very much out of date even as compared with current European history. Minorsky is a man who on the one hand maintains his scholarly independence and on the other hand strives to open up to historians of the Moslem East paths that are at any rate somewhat new. Seventy-six years old, with a scientific output going back fifty-two years, Minorsky continues to produce works remarkable both for their prodigious erudition and for what they often bring of new and fundamental into spheres scarcely studied before. It is in this general perspective that the present work, which in itself constitutes at first sight a rather special study, must be seen.

Minorsky has given up the greater part of his life to studying either medieval Iran itself or the peripheral peoples, on the Armenian and Caucasian side or on the Central Asian side. The region with which the *Studies in Caucasian History* is concerned bestrides Soviet Azerbaijan and Iranian Azerbaijan. Here in the Middle Ages were mingled Arab, Iranian and Kurdish Moslems, and Armenian, Georgian and sometimes Byzantine Christians, not to mention the raids of the "Rus". The history of these countries, great centres of national and social ferment, certainly has its own special features. But the sources that permit of the study of their history and their ethnic composition are extremely diverse in language, dispersed, and very meagre in total. Hence the need to collect and make the most of the slightest information. This is where Minorsky excels.

In general, these sources tell us directly of political history only, and indeed, convinced though one may be of the primacy of other aspects of history, we are forced to start from this, trying later to extract from the interpretation of political facts conclusions for other problems.

It is perhaps to the history of the Kurdish people that the *Studies* bring the amplest contribution. Here too the originality of Minorsky's point of view is remarkable; instead of studying, as do so many scholars, Islam in general without differentiation he sets out to throw into relief each nation's or each people's own history within the Moslem world. He has, moreover, spotlighted the meagre information there is to be found on certain movements of urban autonomy or of certain urban elements, a question that is as a rule totally misunderstood. The essential docu-

ment that he relies on is a lost chronicle by an author of about the year 1100, the essence of which was, however, summed up by a Turkish author of the seventeenth century. This indicates the difficult problems of interpretation set by the text.

The regions studied are naturally attracting the attention of the scholars and the peoples who live there and who are today gaining an increasing consciousness of their historical individuality, whether within the framework of the Soviet Union or whether (amidst what difficulties!) within that of Iran. Minorsky's scholarly work on the past is supported by his attitude of sympathy in the present.

CLAUDE CAHEN

*Institut d'Histoire du Moyen Age,  
Université de Strasbourg.*

## GORKY A L'AMERICAINE

**Autobiography.** Maxim Gorky. Tr. Isidor Schneider. (Elek Books: 25/-.)

IN the foreword to his version of Gorky's autobiographical trilogy the translator says that he preferred a free rendering to the stiffness of too correct translation. A close study of his book suggests that he is making a virtue of necessity, because, at least in the two first parts of the trilogy ("Childhood" and "In The World"), his version seems but a loose American recast of an earlier English translation by Mrs. Gertrude Foakes (T. Warner Laurie Ltd., Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1916 and 1918). It is an astonishing fact that Mrs. Foakes's text already contains all Mr. Schneider's innumerable mistranslations. The errors are completely identical and their number runs into hundreds. Whenever the two translations diverge, Mr. Schneider's is not only always wistful of the mark but an *aggravation* of Mrs. Foakes's original mistake as well. Here are two typical examples:

### From CHILDHOOD

*Gorky (literally):* The whole square was cut up by gullies: at the bottom of one lay thick green slime.

*Mrs. Foakes (p. 86):* The whole square was cut off from the causeway—at one end stood a green thicket.

*Mr. Schneider (p. 50):* The square was separated from the causeway by green, bushy undergrowth.

### From IN THE WORLD

*Gorky (literally):* And a short while ago his new friend, the furrier Khlyst, pinched a hundred-rouble note out of his psalm-book.

*Mrs. Foakes (p. 26):* Not long ago he took a hundred roubles out of the office-book of Xlist the furrier, a new friend of his.



Mr. Schneider (p. 189): A little while ago he made off with a hundred rubles from the office of his new friend, the furrier, Khlist.

It would be hard to suppose that Mr. Schneider merely combed Mrs. Foakes's translation for the sake of adopting her mistakes. Apart from strong Americanisation, Mr. Schneider's text creates the impression of involving no more than rewording and some padding out, by interpolations of words and phrases which Gorky never wrote (the number of words being at least 10 per cent in excess of the normal allowance for the difference of structure of the two languages).

Anyone with a reasonable command of Russian can recognise at once in Mrs. Foakes's English text a number of flagrant errors, such as the incongruous "in the lake's centre she dug a hole", or genitives of proper names mistaken for nominatives. Mr. Schneider preserves them all. When Mrs. Foakes reproduces bits of verse only in transliteration, Mr. Schneider attempts to interpret them (pp. 112 and 113), revealing a surprising ignorance of elementary vocabulary and construction (e.g. *blame* for "trough"; *doorway* for "twin-horned"; *you didn't ask God for much space* for "no little space do you take from God").

The footnotes supplied by Mr. Schneider are usually correct and useful, as when we are told that St. Petersburg is now called Leningrad or that the Pamir is in Central Asia. Of the unhappy exceptions two stand out: one which confuses the title of the popular magazine *Niva* ("Wheatfield") with the name of the river Neva, and another which explains the Multan case as "involving a city in the Indian Punjab." This is pure fantasy. The Multan case, which aroused public opinion in Russia much as the Dreyfus case did in France, was that of the then primitive inhabitants of the village Sary Multan in the Viatka province of Eastern Russia, accused of human sacrifices and finally acquitted after two re-trials.

Recent Soviet translations have often been criticised in this journal, but as their shortcomings are due to faulty English the reader has little difficulty in realising where they have gone wrong. He is quite helpless, however, where the mistakes have been made at the Russian end by an English-speaking translator. In the case of Gorky's trilogy he can do no more than object to its Americanisation, though even that may seem to him a mere device for "putting Gorky across" to the American public. For the rest he has no means of guessing, e.g. that the grandfather is no thief but a victim of theft, or that the Frenchman (p. 62) is not a person but Napoleon's invading army (a common Russian idiom). Still less can he realise that the

translator's supreme ignorance of idiomatic Russian is robbing him of interesting information on some historical and social aspects of Russian life. Thus what appears as inane chatter (p. 92) is in reality Peter the coachman's vivid account of how he was sent to work as a drayman in town to earn money for his owner (the *obrok* system).

It is painful to reflect that, the standards of translation being what they are today, it is only with Russian literature that such incredible liberties are being taken with impunity. For all the other great, and even minor, literatures the days of the *traduttore-traditore* are well past. A garbled version of a German or French masterpiece would have no chances of publication, and even if, improbably, it were to see the light, critics and public would give it short shrift. The English reader can now be confident that any modern translation will not only give him a faithful version of the narrative and of the words and actions of the characters, but also that the translator has done his honest best to reproduce the atmosphere and style of the original. With translations from the Russian there is no such certainty. There are a few—too few—excellent translations, such as the exquisite rendering of Gorky's reminiscences of Tolstoy by Katherine Mansfield and Kotliansky (1934), but for the rest they may be anything all down the scale. A recent example has shown that not even Chekhov is safe. Mrs. Foakes's very faulty translation of the first two parts of Gorky's trilogy is contemporary with Constance Garnett's translation of Chekhov, which, if unimaginative, is on the whole sound. The German forms Mrs. Foakes uses for some Russian names (e.g. *Sascha* for *Sasha*—preserved by Mr. S.) suggest that she may have made her translation not from the Russian original but from a German translation (which has been done openly for several of Gorky's other works). This could be an explanation but not an excuse. Still less could it be an excuse for Mr. Schneider, whose version would then find itself removed one stage farther from the original.

The reader who accepted Mr. Schneider's book as a true and "sensitive" version of Gorky's great work will hardly entirely exonerate him if he thinks that the responsibility for the innumerable errors and distortions it contains lies with Mrs. Foakes. Whatever else he may think of Mr. Schneider's methods, he will at least reproach him for negligence in having reproduced them all without apparently once consulting the original.

If after this double processing the book is still found readable and absorbing by some critics, it is the highest compliment to the indestructible vigour and originality of Gorky's creative genius.

T.S.

## A SOVIET REVIEW OF A BRITISH CHESS BOOK

**The World Chess Championship, 1951.** W. Winter and R. G. Wade. (Turnstile Press: 15/-)

"IN our view the encounter between Botvinnik and Bronstein represents all that is best in modern chess, both in the quality of the games themselves and in the extreme efficiency of the organization under which they were conducted."

So begins a recent book published in England on the match between Botvinnik and Bronstein to determine the championship of the world.

The authors of the book are International Master W. Winter, twice champion of Britain and winner of the international tournament in Scarborough in 1928, and International Master R. Wade, who attended the match.

The book on the Botvinnik-Bronstein match contains some controversial and often erroneous remarks, especially in the chapter on the history of the struggle for the world chess championship; the authors have not quite managed to rid themselves of the trick of substituting anecdotes for descriptions of the event. As a whole the book is interesting and enables us to estimate the reactions the match excited abroad.

The attitude to chess in the USSR made a deep impression on Wade, who writes: "To picture what happened in the recent championship match in Moscow one must imagine New York's Carnegie Hall or London's Royal Albert Hall being given over to playing chess three nights a week and being filled night after night with chess enthusiasts . . ."

Winter and Wade give an interesting and on the whole fair opinion on the quality of the games played in the match. Without denying that both opponents made mistakes, the authors conclude that "these games are unique in the history of world championship chess". They mention the spirit of the contest, in which every game was imbued with unusual tension, there were no short "Grandmaster" draws, there was a variety of openings and the players showed themselves out to win.

"Compared with some past world championship matches the players took greater risks. . . . The acceptance of difficulties, with like difficulties for the opponent, will increasingly influence contemporary chess."

It is an astonishing circumstance that the role of M. I. Chigorin in the world championship struggle is not mentioned in the book.

A chapter of the book is devoted to a description of the careers of the two contestants. The biography of Botvinnik compiled by Wade contains a list of the world champion's various tournament successes.

Winter writes of Bronstein with great warmth and sympathy. He speaks of the Kiev Pioneer Palace, of Bronstein's work during the war, and also of his sporting activities.

The fourth and final chapter gives all the games in the match, with commentaries compiled on the basis of analyses published in the Soviet press and of personal investigation by the authors.

In the authors' opinion Games 2, 5, 14, 18 and 22 are specially rich in beautiful combinations. "Game 18 is one of the finest games ever played in a world championship match, while 19 and 23 are superb examples of the champion's unequalled endgame technique."

In the preface L. Penrose justly writes: "Chess is an international sport; it is also an international language. Enthusiasm for the game induces friendships between people of all kinds, in many different countries, and these contacts are durable in spite of political difficulties. During the disturbed years which have followed the second world war, British chess players have continued to preserve friendly relations with associates abroad. Personal contacts have been maintained, both by visits and by correspondence with their colleagues in Russia, through the good offices of the Chess Section of the Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR. This organisation has the support of a large number of British enthusiasts which includes masters such as the authors of this book and many rank-and-file players. Since there can be little doubt that, at the present time, the finest chess is being played in the USSR, the value of information obtained through these channels is unquestioned."

Penrose likewise points out the value of chess as a medium for increasing cultural ties between nations.

On the whole, this book on the world chess championship match describes this interesting event objectively to the English reader, and promotes the strengthening of cultural ties between the peoples of the USSR and Britain.

A. SEMENOV.

Abridged from *Shakhmaty v SSSR, 10, 1952.*

[This book was reviewed by J. Gilchrist in the *ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL*, Volume XIII, No. 1.]

## PRINCIPLES OF AESTHETICS

**Art and Social Life.** G. V. Plekhanov. (Lawrence and Wishart: 21/-)

PLEKHANOV'S views on aesthetics still come as a challenge to us because they are based on fundamental principles which, although they have influenced our technique of criticism, are little known or

understood in their entirety. Few critics would now venture to consider a literary work without some reference, however fleeting, to the social background which, it is generally acknowledged, somehow influenced its genesis. The dispute still centres on the "how". It is this central question that Plekhanov tried to answer. To the feeling for historical development which he found in such critics as Taine, Ste. Beuve and Guizot, he added a scientific analysis of human behaviour based on the biological work of Darwin and a wide range of nineteenth-century anthropological research. This suggested to him that culture had its roots in material needs and that, in the last analysis, these were primarily economic. He was, however, careful to emphasise that the root may be far removed from the manifestation, and that only the most scrupulous consideration of all the intermediate links, which may differ considerably with different peoples at different stages of social development, could reveal their true relation. Of the *Letters without Address*, first published in 1899-1900, which opens this volume, it is the statement of general principles in the first, "Historical Materialism in Art", which still retains its interest. The evidence adduced in the following letters inevitably appears primitive in the light of later research.

How fruitful was the application of his general principles is amply demonstrated in his essay on "French Dramatic Literature and French Eighteenth Century Painting from the Sociological Standpoint". This revealed not only the connection between the subject matter of art and social relations, but also how these influenced style and how, paradoxically, a classical style was used to serve both Monarchy and Revolution.

The most interesting essay in the book, however, is "Art and Social Life", a paper read to French and Belgian audiences in 1912. Plekhanov here attempted to explain the phenomenon of "art for art's sake" in historical terms, and by a brilliant analysis of French literature as well as reference to Russian and other European writers came to a conclusion broached by Belinsky, that such art arises when the artists "are in hopeless disaccord with the social environment in which they live". Retreat may take different forms, romantic disgust, metaphysical speculation, formalist preoccupations, but the root is the same. Conversely, an active interest in society, be it conservative or revolutionary, will always produce "utilitarian" art. But all art, emphasised Plekhanov, "requires that we examine it not from the standpoint of what ought to have been, but from the standpoint of what was and is."

It was this refusal to use the conclusions drawn from his analysis for political purposes that earned Plekhanov the re-

buke of later Russian Marxist critics whose views are given in the introduction to this book. It will, however, commend him to the Western reader, who is often as interested in the intermediate links between art and society as their ultimate relation. Plekhanov did not underestimate the complex of this "indirect" relation in a "civilised" society, and all who are honestly trying to understand it in its fullness must be grateful for his guidance.

The translation of a difficult text reads well.

B. MALNICK.

## SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY

**The Bolshevik Revolution 1917-1923, Vol. III: Soviet Russia and the World.** E. H. Carr. (Macmillan: 36/-)

THE third volume of Professor Carr's *Bolshevik Revolution* deals with Soviet foreign relations from 1917 to 1923. Supplemented by short notes on the "Marxist attitude to war" and "the pre-history of the Communist International", it unfolds the epic from October to Brest-Litovsk, from intervention to victory in the civil and international war waged on the young Socialist Republic, from weakness and isolation to rapid reassertion as a great power, from the first acts of diplomacy of a new type to a pattern of international intercourse unprecedented in its combination of strength, flexibility and purposefulness.

The story of the Narkomindel is interrupted by a good deal of discussion on the Comintern; the developments in Russia are related to the ebb and tide of the progressive movements as well as the zig-zag policies of the Foreign Offices abroad. The author does not present the theoretical basis of Soviet foreign policy, without which the understanding of its manifestations cannot be complete. He makes no analysis of the ultimate and invisible repositories of power in the non-Soviet world, with all of whose ramifications Moscow had to reckon in charting its course. He draws on sources which, at times at least, would warrant less generous treatment than is accorded them. And inevitably there are omissions—for instance, the staggering tale of Russia's allies and enemies combining against her (pp. 23-25) has no mention of the Franco-British agreement of December 1917 "partitioning" her into spheres of influence.

But as in the preceding volumes on the political and economic path of Soviet Russia, the Professor has gathered and marshalled a store of material on this subject unparalleled in non-Marxist historiography. He has approached it with his usual blend of painstaking scholarship, absorption and intellectual curiosity, his sharp awareness of the mechanism of inter-

national affairs, his strong sense of history. The reader is made conscious of Lenin's herculean task of laying the theoretical and practical foundations of Soviet foreign policy. He is reminded of Trotsky's absurd and abysmal errors, exemplified *inter alia* by this epigram inaugurating his short-lived appointment as Foreign Commissar, "I shall issue a few revolutionary proclamations and then shut up shop" (p. 16); and, by contrast, of Stalin's steady and emphatic support of Lenin, which marked him out as Lenin's trustee and companion-in-arms in the domestic as in the foreign field. The chapters on "Russia and Germany", "Genoa and Rapallo" (incorporating much of Carr's earlier book on Soviet-German relations) and "The Far East—Re-emergence" convey, despite the author's deliberate detachment, a graphic picture of Soviet diplomacy in action.

At the same time, however, this detachment (more pronounced than, say, in the first volume) is responsible for judgments which will be queried by those grounded in Soviet theory and practice. Professor Carr refers often to what he calls the Bolsheviks' "dual, and in some respects self-contradictory, foreign policy" (p. 21). Actually he mistakes for "contradictions" (p. 30) and "dilemmas" the difference between strategy and tactics, failing to see that precisely the changes in the latter underline all the more clearly the fixity and oneness of the Soviet policy of Socialism and peace. He speaks more than once of "the two facets of Soviet foreign policy—the encouragement of world revolution and the pursuit of national security" (p. 58). He ascribes to the Kremlin "... in foreign affairs ... the goal of world revolution ..." (p. 304). When and where has the Government proclaimed and pursued such a goal in its foreign policy? Governments at war or under external pressure always seek to undermine the adversary through his domestic opposition. Such was, for instance, the policy of President Wilson for Germany and Austria in 1917-18, or of the democratic coalition in the recent war. Why then suggest that it is specifically and obnoxiously Bolshevik to expect relief from, and co-operation with, the enemies of one's enemies?

Professor Carr must know that revolution is not a communist export item, but a home product of capitalism and imperialism. Certainly Lenin in 1917-18 had "faith in the revolution" outside Russia (p. 7). Certainly he argued in October that "the international situation gives us a series of objective grounds for believing that ... we shall have all proletarian Europe on our side", and Stalin urged the line which "sets the course for the victory of the revolution and relies on Europe ..." (p. 9). Certainly this line was continued on occasions after 1918. But from formulating policy "on objective grounds", from

"reliance on Europe" when such reliance was objectively justified, from having a natural affinity with, and welcoming as allies, progressive movements abroad which *actually* exist, it is a far cry to pursuing "the goal of world revolution". It is a pity that Professor Carr, however unintentionally, should lend the weight of his authority to a myth. After all, it is his own conclusion that in 1918 "the action of the allies confirmed and intensified the ideological aspect of Soviet foreign policy ... if only in the interest of national self-preservation. The vital question whether the co-existence of capitalist and socialist states was possible had ... in some, at any rate, of the [Soviet] pronouncements ... been answered in the affirmative ..." (p. 88). Nor is this true merely of 1918.

ARTHUR JENKINS

## PROBLEMS IN MUSIC

**How Music Expresses Ideas.** Sidney Finkelstein. (Lawrence and Wishart: 9/6.)

THIS book is obviously intended for the general reader who is responsive to music, and it should be estimated as such. It would be unfair, therefore, to expect any really penetrating analysis of the basic problems facing composers today, sufficient to satisfy the musicians who are themselves grappling with these problems. The writer of such a book faces special dangers. In his desire to present the problems in their clearest form he may find himself accepting over-simple, mechanically applied definitions of such terms as "formalism" and "realism". Mr. Finkelstein has not succeeded in avoiding this danger; perhaps it is impossible for a popular writer to avoid it until musicians themselves have reached a much higher stage in the comprehension of the nature of their art.

Mr. Finkelstein's study of social conditions and how they give rise to their particular artistic forms in primitive, feudal, capitalist and socialist societies is convincing. Difficulties, however, arise when he is concerned with the *content* rather than the *language* of musical works. He too readily assumes, for instance, that a composer's known ideas on philosophy or sociology (as in Wagner, Chaikovsky and Shostakovich) are necessarily expressed in his music. That a composer may not, in fact, do this is at the root of the problem facing those who, in the USSR and elsewhere, are desirous of creating music fully expressive of the content of socialism. For example, he describes Shostakovich's *Leningrad Symphony* as "inspiring them [the Soviet people] in their collective struggle against the forces of reaction and human destruction". There is no doubt that Shostakovich intended his symphony



to do precisely this, and, at the time of its first performance, Soviet critics agreed with Mr. Finkelstein; but a very different estimate of the work was formulated in the 1948 discussions. Which opinion is right is not in itself important, but it does show that the problem of "how music expresses ideas" is not nearly as simple as Mr. Finkelstein would have us believe. Its complexity is fully realised by Soviet composers today.

BERNARD STEVENS

## AN OUT-OF-DATE STORY

**Soviet Law in Action.** Boris A. Konstantinovsky. Ed. Harold J. Berman. (Harvard University Press and Geoffrey Cumberlege: 10/-.)

THE title of this book, *Soviet Law in Action*, is somewhat ambitious, and still more inaccurate; it consists in substance of the writing-up from years-old recollection of fifty-three cases, a few of them important but most of them trivial, which were litigated in Odessa or the Odessa region during a period of years ending in 1941.

The sub-title, *The Recollected Cases of a Soviet Lawyer, Boris A. Konstantinovsky*, is a little less ambitious and a little less inaccurate; but in truth Mr. Harold J. Berman, who is said to "edit" the cases, has in fact written the whole of the book, basing it in part on Mr. Konstantinovsky's recollection and in part on his own ideas as to life in the USSR.

Mr. Konstantinovsky worked as a professor of law and as the chief legal adviser of a large bread trust in Odessa until the Rumanians took the city in 1941. He then ceased to work for the bread trust but continued till 1944 as a professor of law under the Rumanians. When the Germans stepped in in 1944 and "evacuated" the University, Konstantinovsky and his family went with them, being later "liberated" by the Americans in Germany. He—naturally enough—thought it better not to return to his own country after this tale of collaboration and emigration, and found his way to the U.S.A.

His whole experience of the Soviet Union is thus nearly twelve years out of date. His narrative of the cases, with a little explanation of the working of the bread trust and other matters, which Mr. Berman often records in the present tense—giving a misleading impression—in fact no more describes life in the USSR today than Dickens describes the England of 1953.

The curious thing is that, when one studies this thoroughly out-of-date and largely trivial group of episodes, one finds little malice in it. We learn from Mr. Konstantinovsky that in the Odessa of his day many people stole, many got tied up in

red tape, and some judges were inefficient or foolish or cowardly; but what we would hold to be just decisions were nearly always reached, and workers were obviously treated with the greatest fairness and consideration. The picture he gives would be of some value and interest if it were not so old, so trivial, and so fragmentary.

It is left to Mr. Berman to make the book into a bad one. Advancing as the excuse or reason for publishing such a book the old shallow story that it is impossible to get direct and up-to-date information about life in the USSR—surely a good reason for *not* publishing it—he manages to build on these tiny foundations a whole anti-Soviet story of the "precarious existence" of law (in a country with a highly developed and increasingly efficient and erudite body of lawyers and judges) and of some mysterious "co-existence . . . of a system of force and a system of law". The book is in the end little but one more trivial bit of anti-Soviet writing of the sort that makes one wonder why time and labour are devoted to such books.

D. N. PRITT, Q.C.

## A CLASSIC ABRIDGED

**Journey for Our Time.** The Journals of the Marquis de Custine. (Arthur Barker: 16/-.)

THIS abridged version of an established classic on the reign of Nicholas I has been given a new title and a new meaning by an introduction written by a former American ambassador to the USSR. Frustrated by confinement within the narrow limits of a foreign diplomat's life in Moscow, General Bedell Smith and his staff sought consolation and revenge in the work of a royalist and Catholic observer who brought a shrewd eye and inquiring mind to bear on Orthodoxy and Autocracy in Russia in 1839. In his report they found what they considered to be striking analogies with the conditions of "our time" in the USSR. The abridgement has been made to bring these analogies into more telling relief by excluding a great deal of matter which brings the character of the author into the picture and thereby reveals his prejudices as well as his penetration, and by using the more dramatic of his opinions as headlines. Even more disingenuous is the note on the book jacket which states that the book is banned in the Soviet Union, although it is in fact given as a primary source for a study of the period in both the first edition (1940, 75,000 copies) and the second (1949, 100,000 copies) of the standard text-book on Russian history for university students issued by the Academy of Sciences and the History department of Moscow University and is also described at length and quoted in a standard historiographical



work, *Istochnikovedeniye Istorii SSSR*, Vol. II, (1940, 20,000 copies).

De Custine moved in court circles and had little contact with the ordinary people. His brilliant portrait of the Tsar, whom he rather admired but finally found lacking in magnanimity, his abhorrence of the evils of absolute power and his disgust with the omnipresent stupidity of a soulless bureaucracy therefore lacked the third dimension of what was really happening in the world outside the drawing room and chancellory. What he saw of the people in the streets he often misunderstood and even more often romanticised.

"The people have a certain charm that one senses but is not expressed; it is an oriental languor mixed with the romantic dreaminess of the people of the North and all of this in the uncultivated but noble form which constitutes the merit of primitive talents" (p. 145).

"Other nations have tolerated oppression, the Russian nation has loved it, she still loves it" (p. 182).

This insistence on the passivity of the Russians did not prevent the legitimist marquis from denouncing the Decembrists in the roundest terms and prompted him to call peasants who had risen against their masters "cannibals". De Custine confessed that "I have been struck by the abuse and have seen nothing of the remedy" (p. 228). The remedy would have been as unpalatable to him as was the abuse.

Frightened by the social implications of what he saw, de Custine tried to find an explanation of the Russian enigma in Karamzin's dramatic pen-portrait of Ivan IV and the peculiar features of the Russian landscape and climate. "Add to this that for six months, the most rigorous of the winter, one dares to breathe the outdoor air only a couple of hours during the day, unless one is a Russian peasant." His rediscoverers evidently share his superstitions. They make no distinction between what is valuable in his work, what is fairy-tale, traveller's tale or simply a bad guess belied by history. They have ears only for echoes, and the striking differences that would beset an observer even in the most restricted circumstances go unnoticed. In that they show less curiosity than de Custine and, if we compare the foreword of de Custine himself, particularly in its unabridged version, with the pointed argument of his admirers, less judgment.

Historical parallels from the past are inevitably tempting to those who cannot understand the present. Moreover, there is a certain fascination in hunting them out. "At the sight of all these categories of spies who examined me and questioned us, I was seized by the desire to yawn, which could easily have turned to a desire to weep, not for myself but for this people. So many precautions considered indispen-

sable here but completely dispensed with elsewhere warned me that I was on the verge of entering an empire of fear, and fear, like sadness, is contagious" (p. 44).

Should we use this to equate the America of McCarthy with the Russia of Nicholas's Third Section? I think not.

B. MALNICK.

## SLAVONIC PAPERS

*Oxford Slavonic Papers. Vol. III.* Ed. S. Kononov. (Clarendon Press and Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1952: 12/6, pp. 152.)

THE Warden of Wadham's lecture on Lermontov, delivered five years ago and now reprinted in Professor Kononov's latest volume, is a noble piece of writing, worthy of its subject; but one would have wished to see more adequately illustrated the poet's hatred of Tsardom and the slavery on which it rested—hatred which Lermontov, as a man of the world, felt no less keenly than any of his contemporaries. Mr. E. H. Carr has discovered nearly 150 unknown letters of Alexander Herzen, and publishes thirty of them: they provide an important addition to materials for Herzen's biography and for the study of his ideas. Mr. J. S. G. Simmons tells the pathetic story of an early effort to initiate Russian studies at Oxford, in November 1844—some five months after Nicholas I had visited England, a circumstance which the author does not mention in his learned account of the episode. Other papers will be of interest to philologists.

A.R.

## RUSSIAN NOT SO DIFFICULT

*The Actress.* Ilya Ehrenburg. *Petya the Cock.* V. Ivanov. (Methuen, Russian Readers: 3/9.)

*The Saga of the Sergeant.* V. Ivanov. (Methuen, Russian Readers: 4/-.)

NEXT to speaking easily comes reading easily, as an attraction for the learning of a language. It is true a reading facility has its dangers and disillusionments. Confronted by a voluble (as it seems to us) Frenchman, Italian or Russian, we seem to find little correspondence between the words we have read so easily and understood so clearly and the sounds made by the "native". The mental processes at work in reading and in speaking are different. That is why the value of these two excellent little books would have been greatly enhanced had there been at the end a dozen or so questions in Russian to be answered by the student in Russian.

The booklets have been prepared with great care. Every aid to make Russian reading easy is provided, a full vocabulary, full and helpful notes on those constructions in the text that are peculiar to Russian, with clear grammatical explanations, and special notes on the vocabulary with, again, the relevant grammatical ex-

planations. It is a pity that when rules are stated they are not immediately followed by an example; the average student finds it very valuable to have a rule exemplified immediately. This is a lack in many language books.

Occasionally the translation of a phrase or word seems unnecessarily laboured, as for instance in *The Actress*, where *polustanok* is translated by "intermediate station" when in fact it means just what it says, "half-way stop". *Sobirdalis na okhotu* would have been better and more correctly translated by "they were going shooting", rather than "they intended to go shooting". But these are small criticisms of a well-produced series that is also pleasant to the eye and the touch. It is to be hoped that further volumes will give short stories that are more contemporary. There is a wealth of these today, some of them brilliant, dealing with the various great construction schemes.

Russian has an importance today far beyond the aesthetic pleasure of a beautiful language or the utilitarian value for a tourist. Like English in the nineteenth century, Russian in this century is becoming a world language. It is the first foreign language taught in the people's democracies. It is fast beginning to replace English as the pre-eminent foreign language in China. Further, new, challenging ideas in the sciences and the arts, optimistic in philosophy, are finding their first expression in Russian. One can foresee the time when Russian will be considered as essentially natural for an educated person to know as French has been for centuries (without we hope, replacing French). Anything that encourages the study of Russian is thus to be welcomed.

BEATRICE KING

## A USEFUL RUSSIAN READER

**Modern Russian Reader for Intermediate Classes.** Lila Pargment. (Pitman: 16/-.)

THIS book should prove a valuable addition to the limited number of good Russian readers for the intermediate level. The choice of stories and extracts has been determined by five sound criteria explained by the editor in the foreword. The passages cannot fail to interest students by their variety of subjects and the vivid style of narrative and dialogue. The writers represented include Chekhov, Gorky, Goncharov and Tolstoy as well as a number of contemporary authors such as Ilyenkov, Trenyev, Sobolev and others.

The book is provided with a substantial vocabulary. Idioms and colloquialisms are translated in footnotes. The accuracy of these is in some cases open to criticism, e.g. p. 23 "He should talk!" "Must not brag!", or p. 103 "On the eve of New Year's day". The exercises follow a uniform system of questions and short sum-

maries of the stories. A little more variety of practice could perhaps have been offered to students by giving a number of summaries in English to be translated into Russian. Text and vocabulary are carefully accented.

It is regrettable that this excellent reader may by its price of 16s. prove beyond the means of many English students in schools and evening classes.

G. BALG

## CORNUCOPIA OF SCHOLARSHIP

**A Bibliographical Guide to the Russian Language.** B. O. Unbegaun and J. S. G. Simmons. (Geoffrey Cumberlege, O.U.P.: 25/-.)

OUT of his lectures at Oxford Professor Unbegaun has presented us with a work of fundamental importance for Russian scholarship. It consists in a selective list (1,043 items), with commentary, of works on Russian philology, classified under: general bibliography, history of the subject, and periodicals; origins of the language, texts and palaeography, and history of grammar and vocabulary and of the "literary language" (*literaturny yazyk*); description of modern grammar, vocabulary, dialects and "special languages".

As a whole, the classification is unexceptionable. But one would query the inclusion in Morphology of the *uses* of forms (though the consequent restriction of Syntax to sentence-form is not consistent). To take as example a topic apparently regarded, rightly, as most important for Russian, verbal aspect, its ramifications are not brought out clearly by lumping together its morphology and semantics. (Nor is the topic as a whole sufficiently demarcated under Historical.)

This topic should surely also include general works (which pay much attention to Russian) like Holt's and Sorensen's structuralistic analyses, and articles in English, Ferrell's on Russian aspect in *Word* and Brown's on the Russian imperfective in *Slavonic Review*. (Nothing English appears under Periodicals, presumably because *Slavonic Review* still leaves linguistic subjects to *Revue des études slaves*—a sad reflection on our state of Slavonic scholarship.)

Although alluding to the new turn in Soviet linguistics since 1950, Professor Unbegaun makes no mention of Stalin's work which initiated it. And this though he does include general works not exclusively devoted to Russian, e.g. Meschaninov's *Chleny Predlozheniya i Chasti Rechii*. Moreover, though *Voprosy Yazyka*, begun 1952, is included under Periodicals, none of the articles in it are cited, e.g. Vinogradov's review of Meshchaninov.

In general, it is impossible to know

whether the omissions (even for the year 1952) are deliberate or due to oversight. For example, though History of Grammar includes Entwistle & Morison's *Russian and the Slavonic Languages*,\* de Bray's *Guide to the Slavonic Languages*† is not to be found anywhere. In History of Phonetics, Professor Matthews's "Pronunciation of Medieval Russian" (*Slavonic Review*) is not accompanied by his account of the pronunciation of *jat'* in the Ramovs memorial volume of *Slavistická Revija*, and in History of Verbal Inflection one misses Issatchenko's "Tense and Auxiliary Verbs" (*Language* 1940). Frcek's "Spisovny Jazyk Rusky" in "Slovanské Spisovné Jazyky" (1937), and Trofimov's *Handbook of Russian* Volume II (1939), might have been included in Modern Grammar, General Works. The Language of the 1917 Revolution omits Borovoy's "Novye Slova" (*Krasnaya Nov'*, 1938-40) and Mendras's "Remarques sur le vocabulaire de la révolution russe" (*Mélanges Boyer*, 1925).

A selection inevitably raises issues of opinion. All in all, however, the Bibliographical Guide (which is printed with the admirable clarity characteristic of the Clarendon Press) is a considerable achievement, and every student of Russian will have cause to be grateful to its compilers.

J. ELLIS

\* Reviewed in ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL, Vol. XI, No. 1.

† Reviewed in ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL, Vol. XII, No. 4.

## COMRADELY AID

**Rumanian Summer.** Jack Lindsay and Maurice Cornforth. (Lawrence and Wishart: 5/-.)

FOR SCR readers as such, the chief interest of *Rumanian Summer* will be found in the authors' clear picture of what is implied by Soviet aid to less developed countries.

As one reads the exciting and inspiring story of Rumanian achievement, one is aware all the time how much the very existence of the Soviet Union means to Rumania, as indeed to all the people's democracies. The impact of the Soviet Union on Rumania is not only that of a country which shows clearly that "the aid of one socialist country to another is a very different thing from economic aid" in such forms as Marshall Plans. "Soviet aid, with its loans of big machines, has not meant the flattening of Rumanian machine-industry"; on the contrary, it has played a big part in stimulating heavy industry and the production of ever-bigger machinery. Soviet friendship means not only that Rumanian textile workers are today successfully managing Soviet looms which contribute to the rapid expansion of production, but also the con-

clusion of a trade agreement which provides Rumania with all kinds of heavy machinery for the development of Rumanian heavy industry, and the fact that the great Scanteia publishing-house, "where soon they will be publishing books or brochures in 150,000 copies daily, as well as three million copies of various newspapers", produced its first printing on a great rotary press built in the Soviet Union. Again, it means not only the thousands of tons of grain sent to drought-suffering Rumania, or the thousands of tons of coke, coal and steel sent in 1945-46, when the Soviet Union too was suffering immense shortages, but also the fact that the joint Rumanian-Soviet companies for the country's industrial developments are on a basis of equality, with profits equally shared. There are no strings to Soviet loans; Soviet specialists advise and instruct and then go home.

The impact of Soviet friendship is perhaps greatest in the confidence, assurance and inspiration that the support of this mighty socialist country helps to give to little Rumania. The Soviet Union infects her friends with her own people's enthusiasm for the building of a new world, for daring experiment, for work, so that Stakhanovites and innovators become as Rumanian as Russian, and Pavlov, Lysenko and Michurin become a shared property.

In parts, as in the first chapter, the book is almost lyrical. One delights with the authors in what they see. There is a wealth of information about Rumania past and present. Particularly valuable is the chapter *Jews, Armenians and Tartars*.

BEATRICE KING

## THE UNSEEING EYE

**Meet the Russians.** "Vicky." (Reinhardt and Evans: 10/6.)

THE fact that Soviet halls, art galleries, museums and bookshops are crowded with all kinds of working people, and that there is in the Soviet Union a vast hunger for learning, might make one suppose that ordinary Soviet people bear on their faces and in their eyes some mark of their intelligent interest in culture. And when I passed from years of reading and studying Soviet newspapers and periodicals in the original Russian to the reality of a visit there in September 1952, that reality far surpassed anything one might have imagined.

What a pity it is that Vicky, however, a likeable man with a flair for comic stories at midnight, passed on that same trip from unknowing to unreality. Skilled and competent in the world of the Bolshoi Theatre ballet, he uses a fine clean line when he wants to capture the magic grace of

Galina Ulanova (p. 17). But faced with the Soviet people's faith in the future—which he calls almost childlike—his artist's eye almost always fails to read this faith in any line or expression, any mouth or eye or set of the head, of the quite imaginary Russians he draws.

For they are imaginary. How can these moronic, beetroot-faced, bovine, button-nosed people that he draws have the vitality, the self-confidence, the vast energy his own text credits them with? How is it that his artist's eye failed to catch the look in the eyes of the seventeen-year-old boys we saw at school in Moscow, and registered only the shaven-headed small boys, who pop up all over his pages without a single explanatory note that it is a Russian custom to shave small boys' heads in the hot summer, and that the hair had not grown back by September? Similarly, the custom that makes women wear warm head-shawls and men padded jackets with the onset of the bitter winter has somehow been transferred from their clothes to their faces. The kindergarten and other children (pp. 40, 42 and elsewhere) look shapeless about the face and head as well as the body, while the little "boy" on page 9 looks as though Vicky had "seen" him after a midnight supper darkly through a glass of Georgian wine. And although ironing-board figures are not common in the Soviet Union, did all the ladies really look like the bag-wash from the head downwards, even young girls on park benches?

As illusory as the fictitious "beggar" on page 37 were the endless "Stalins" in Georgia. A tendency to a high-bridged nose dark eyes and the occasional dark moustache—Georgian national traits—no more makes lots of little Stalins than cigars in the mouths of fat men make so many Churchills.

No, Vicky, no one followed you about in Moscow's streets and parks as you sketched. Why should they? But if the ordinary people had not had their eyes on the present and the future they might have argued the unreality of the sketches you filled your notebook with.

Not being an artist, I treasure not only my personal notebook—written records of our visit—but also the photographic record we each and all received. Perhaps, Vicky, you will go to that modest blue box, pull out the drawer, and look again into the reality of the superb, confident handsomeness of the Georgian kindergarten headmistress (your page 57), with her white crown of hair, her still-young face and sparkling, intelligent eyes; perhaps you will look again at the kindergarten children in their embroidered aprons, at the bright-eyed, fresh-faced boys and girls of Moscow and Tbilisi, and draw again.

E. FOX.

## UNSUCCESSFUL POEM

**Lenin: A Modern Epic Poem.** James Paulden.  
(Published by the author: 3/-)

RIGHTLY, Mr. Paulden wishes to express his admiration for Lenin's greatness. Unfortunately, his comprehension of the subject is narrow and inadequate, and his poetic form is cramped, weak and extremely monotonous. His work is a chronological account of Lenin's life, with occasional disquisitions on Liberty, Earth, Death, and so on; no change in form or diction marks the transitions of mood or emphasis. He seems to have gone laboriously through every scrap of information he could lay hands on, and has produced not "an epic poem" but an unevenly tendentious potted biography, a booklet like a patchwork counterpane but lacking its artificial formalised beauty. He fairly deifies Lenin; but his attempt "to justify God's ways to Man" shows the Miltonic presumption without Milton's warrant. Much of the work might have been accepted as a well-meaning if inadequate tribute to Lenin, but Mr. Paulden's starry-eyed view of Trotsky, his sour attitude towards practically everyone else he mentions, his preposterous claim that Lenin was the sole Marxist socialist extant in Russia ("all others baffled"), his metaphor of the Russian people as sheep herded by sheep-dog Bolsheviks to Shepherd Lenin's whistle, and other such touches, put him out of court as a serious witness to Lenin's greatness.

S.J.

## PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

RUSSIA PAST AND PRESENT. A. G. Mazour. (*Macmillan*, 40/-.)

SPRING ON THE ODER. E. Kazakevich. (*FLPH*, *unpriced*.)

THE DAWN OF A GREAT PROJECT. V. Galaktionov and A. Agranovsky. (*FLPH*, *unpriced*.)

THE REAL STALIN. Yves Delbos. Tr. Bernard Miall. (*Allen and Unwin*, 25/-.)

THROUGH THE IRON CURTAIN BY THE BACK DOOR. U Kyaw Min. (*Ernest Benn*, 10/6.)

WORKS, Vol. I. J. V. Stalin. (*Lawrence and Wishart*, 5/-.)

# SCR NOTES

## LONDON MEETINGS AND OTHER EVENTS

April—June 1953

(All at 14 Kensington Square unless otherwise stated)

### April

- 21st: Lecture. *The Classical and the Baroque Motifs in the Planning of the centre of St. Petersburg*. B. Lubetkin. Chair: John Summerson. (**Architecture and Planning Group**.)
- 23rd: Film. *Uzbekistan*. New Soviet colour documentary. Introductory talk on the Uzbek Republic: W. P. Coates. (**Film Section**.)
- 29th: PROKOFIEV MEMORIAL RECITAL. Leonard Cassini, Hubert Greenslade, Janet Howe, Frank Merrick, Tessa Robbins. At the Royal Festival Hall. (**Music Section**.)

### May

- 10th: Children's Meeting and Film Show. Councillor Mary Baxter, J.P. (**Education Section**.)
- 11th: Exhibition of Soviet school text-books. Lecture: *The Teaching of British History in Soviet Schools*. Brian Pearce. (**Education Section**.)
- 14th: Lecture. *Films and Film-makers in the USSR*. George Elvin. Film: *Soviet Tadzhikistan*. (**Film Section**.)
- 21st: Film. *Armenia*. Introductory talk: Judith Todd. (**Film Section**.)
- 27th: Recital. New Soviet tape-recordings played on the magnetophone. (**Music Section**.)
- 29th: Film. *Country Doctor*. By invitation only. At Film House. (**Medical Section**.)

### June

- 4th: Reception to Alexei Surkov and Madame Elistratova. By invitation only.
- 9th: Symposium on Mayakovsky. Lecture: Harold Silver. Readings: George Bishop, David Dawson, Joan Rodker, Eddie Woods, introduced by Stella Jackson. (**Theatre Section and Writers' Group**.)
- 11th: Opera Recital. Talk illustrated by recordings. D. T. Richnell. (**Music Section**.)
- 17th: Lecture. *Stalin's "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR"*. Dr. R. L. Meek. (**Social Sciences Section**.)
- 18th: Film. *Latvia*. Introductory talk on the Latvian Republic: The Rev. Stanley Evans. (**Film Section**.)
- 23rd: Lecture. *The Soviet Attitude to International Law*. J. Gaster. (**Legal Section**.)
- 27th: SUMMER FAIR AND DANCE.



## SUMMER FAIR

THE Garden Fair on Saturday, June 27, was a brilliant success, as was the dance the same evening. The Society offers its warmest thanks to all who helped with gifts, with pricing, with preparing refreshments, with serving at stalls, with running sideshows and films and with moving furniture and clearing away. Cordial thanks are due also to the singers Judith Goldbloom, A. L. Lloyd and Kay Molinari, and to the puppet-masters Kate and Lucian Amorel, whose entertainments were such an attraction. Those who were unable to attend the fair may like to know that some gramophone records, petit-point embroidery and colour reproductions of paintings are still available for sale at bargain prices.

### SCR PROVINCIAL SECRETARIES

Readers of THE ANGLO-SOVIET JOURNAL may wish to get in touch with the Secretary of the local SCR Committee so that they may be kept informed of local SCR activities. The following list is appended for their convenience.

**BIRMINGHAM** : Mr. R. F. Smith, 13 Langley Road, Small Heath, Birmingham 10.

**BRADFORD** : Mr. Dennis Jackson, 17 Ashfield Place, Fagley, Bradford.

**BRISTOL** : Mr. H. Gifford, 9 Westbury Court Road, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol.

**CAMBRIDGE** : Mr. B. Birnberg, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

**LEEDS** : Mr. A. Dressler, Russian Department, The University, Leeds 2.

**LIVERPOOL** : Mr. E. Dawson, Flat 3, 3 Hamilton Road, New Brighton, Cheshire.

**MANCHESTER** : Mr. R. Barstow, 20 Cartwright Street, Audenshaw, Manchester.

**NEWCASTLE** : Mr. F. H. Walker, 56 Moorside South, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

**OXFORD** : Mr. J. Bradley, St. John's College, Oxford.

**SHEFFIELD** : Mrs. Betty Hunt, 98 Totley Brook Road, Totley Rise, Sheffield.

**SOUTHAMPTON** : Mr. A. L. Merson, 109 Ethelbert Avenue, Southampton.

**YORK** : Mr. W. Coleman, 80 Monkgate, York.

**SWANSEA** : Mrs. Farrington, 4 Bethany Lane, Westcross, Mumbles, Swansea.

# RUSSIA TODAY BOOK CLUB

*Some previous choices still  
available :*

HAPPINESS	P. Pavlenko
EARLY JOYS	K. Fedin
GUARANTEES OF PEACE	V. Sobko
THE BADGERS	L. Leonov
STEPAN RAZIN	A. Chapygin
STORY ABOUT A REAL MAN	B. Polevoi
SPRINGTIME IN SAKEN	G. Gulia
ARTICLES AND PAMPHLETS	M. Gorky
THE ARTAMONOV	M. Gorky

*and the July choice :*

STUDENTS Y. Trifonov  
All 3/- each post free

*Also :*

NO ORDINARY SUMMER K. Fedin  
2 vols. 5/- post free  
ROAD TO LIFE A. Makarenko  
3 vols. 8/6 post free  
WIND FROM THE SOUTH E. Green  
2/6 post free

*RTBC membership costs 2/6 a  
year but is free to members of  
BSFS, SCR, Scottish and Irish  
USSR Societies.*

Write to:

**Russia Today Book  
Club**

36 SPENCER STREET,  
LONDON, E.C.1

# SCR

## DOCUMENTS

*Recent titles include :*

Products Exchange  
1/6 (1/-). Soc. Sci. 5

Two Secondary School  
History Syllabuses.  
2/- (1/6). Ed. 15

More about Polytechni-  
sation  
1/6 (1/-). Ed. 16

A Reply to American  
Critics of Pavlov  
3/- (2/-). Pav. 5

Sherrington and Pavlov  
1/6 (1/-). Pav. 6

Prices in brackets are those  
for SCR members. Post 3d.  
Please quote reference  
numbers (bold type) when  
ordering.

## PAMPHLETS

British Doctors in Russia.  
1/-

British Teachers in the  
USSR. 2/6.

(Post 3d.)

